

# RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY

Vol. V

Autumn Number, 1936

No. 4

## EDITORIAL BOARD

JOHN BAILLIE

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN

LUCIUS H. BUGBEE

CHARLES K. GILBERT

LYNN HAROLD HOUGH

JAMES R. JOY

HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

JOHN W. LANGDALE

HOWARD C. ROBBINS

FREDERICK K. STAMM

## ADVISORY COUNCIL

Harvie Branscomb

Edgar Sheffield Brightman

Clarence Tucker Craig

Albert Edward Day

Wilbert F. Howard

Carl Sumner Knopf

Edward H. Kraus

Umphrey Lee

Edwin Lewis

Mclyar H. Lichliter

Halford E. Luccock

Harris Franklin Rall

Richard Roberts

Wilbour E. Saunders

Luther A. Weigle

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
S. Parkes Cadman .....	Francis J. McConnell 483
God in History .....	Edgar P. Dickie 494
Religion as Response .....	J. M. Shaw 514
The Younger Theologians .....	Samuel McCrea Cavert 520
Further Thought on Form Criticism .....	Frederick C. Grant 532
The Preacher an Interpreter .....	A. Stewart Woodburne 544
Recent Palestinian Archaeology .....	C. C. McCown 552
The Reformation and Present Problems .....	Albert Hyma 564
The Social Sciences and Religion .....	Charles A. Ellwood 576
The Struggle for International Sanity .....	Frederick W. Norwood 584
Washington Gladden—And After .....	Gaius Glenn Atkins 593
Letters of a Japanese Sailor Boy .....	Herbert Welch 605
Christianity Confronts Communism .....	Cornelius Krusé 613
Book Reviews .....	616
Bookish Brevities .....	637
Index—Vol. V .....	639

Editorial correspondence should be addressed to John W. Langdale, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Business communications regarding subscriptions, etc., should be addressed to The Abingdon Press, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter January 16, 1932, at the post-office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. This number is the October, 1936, issue.

Subscription price, \$2.00 per year; postage free U. S. Possessions and Mexico; to Canada, 18 cents additional; other foreign postage, 30 cents; single copies, 75 cents.

Published by  
**THE ABINGDON PRESS**  
NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS  
LIBRARY

## Who's Who?

**GAIUS GLENN ATKINS, D.D.** Professor of Homiletics and Sociology, Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

**SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT, D.D.** General Secretary of The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

**EDGAR P. DICKIE, M.C., B.A. (Oxon.), M.A., B.D. (Edin.).** Professor of Divinity in the University of Saint Andrews, Scotland.

**CHARLES A. ELLWOOD, Ph.D.** Professor of Sociology, Duke University, Durham, N. C.

**FREDERICK C. GRANT, D.D., Th.D.** Dean of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Ill.

**ALBERT HYMA, Ph.D.** Department of History, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

**CORNELIUS KRUSÉ, Ph.D.** Professor of Philosophy, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

**FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL, D.D., LL.D.** Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, resident in New York City.

**C. C. McCOWN, Ph.D.** Dean and Professor of New Testament Literature, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Cal. Director of excavations at Jerash, 1930-31. Annual Professor and Acting Director 1935-36 in the American School of Oriental Research, Jerusalem.

**FREDERICK W. NORWOOD, D.D.** Minister of Evangelism, Free Church Council of Great Britain.

**J. M. SHAW, M.A., D.D.** Professor, Queen's Theological College, Kingston, Ontario, Canada.

**HERBERT WELCH, D.D.** Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Eastern Asia, 1916-28, 1932-36.

**A. STEWART WOODBURN, Ph.D.** Department of Christian Theology, Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.



## S. Parkes Cadman

FRANCIS J. McCONNELL

AT the time of his death a few weeks ago more than one competent judge pronounced S. Parkes Cadman the foremost preacher in all the world—preacher, that is to say, and not ecclesiastical official. Certainly it is not far from the truth to assert that, counting in the radio addresses, he had probably been heard by more people than had any other speaker in human history. Of course, we have to think of his career as chiefly in the United States, but through fifty years of public speaking more than once a day, he found the United States giving him first and last an incalculably huge audience.

In dealing with a life like Cadman's about all we can do is to look at it. Formal analysis is not especially helpful, for the powers were on too large a scale for exact measurement and were too inimitably mixed together to be rightly estimated when taken apart. It is worth-while, however, just to look at the forces and qualities which made him what he was, always reminding ourselves that when we have finished looking we have not seen all, and have probably missed what was most important.

That Doctor Cadman was of enormous physical vitality goes without saying. No human organism could have endured and done what he did without phenomenal strength. To meet the demands of a parish like the Central Congregational Church of Brooklyn for much more than a third of a century, to write at least one new sermon a week through all his ministry, to lecture five times a week through the greater part of the year, to spend during long periods as many nights in a sleeping car as in his bed at home, to write within a dozen years a half-dozen books, each of no inconsiderable size, to answer radio letters by the hundred, to cross the Atlantic Ocean more than sixty times, to serve long terms in positions like the presidency of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, to maintain close personal relations with scores upon scores of friends who almost literally lived upon his help—well, there is no need of carrying the staggering total further. This is a cross-section of his life from about his thirtieth to his seventy-second year. Yet it would be a mistake to fancy that all this was done by an onrushing tide of inexhaustible physical resource.

Doctor Cadman was not a spendthrift of such resource. No man of our times, in possession of treasures of bodily and nervous wealth at all comparable to his, guarded them more carefully than did he. It was astonishing to see the output in energy derived from such a small intake of calories.

Naturally the foundation of his work as a preacher was laid in his very early years. His father was a Shropshire coal miner and the son went to work in the mines at the age of twelve. The English coal mines have never been known as encouraging softness in the workers, and in 1876 they called for a firmer hardness than in later years when trade-union influences had come more fully into play. The work was severe and the hours long. In the winter season, young Cadman would have to go to work before daylight and return after dark, which meant that during a stretch of three or four months in that high latitude he saw daylight only on part of Saturday and on Sunday. His task was not only hard and dreary but always made darker by the constant possibility, and frequent fact, of tragedy. The miners had to be lowered into the deep shafts in bucket-like cars by cables, the little patch of daylight above fast diminishing and the darkness below as rapidly becoming like that Egyptian darkness which could be felt. Safety devices were far from adequate, and the total working environment about as depressing as can well be imagined. Take the daylight out of a boy's life and there is not likely to be much boy left.

The seriousness of the life was re-enforced by the earnestness of the religion of the day—especially by Wesleyanism. To the end of his life, Doctor Cadman spoke with deep respect of the religious experience and practices of his early relatives and friends. He used to attend the revival services, where there was absolutely "no foolishness." The older brethren in the church used to pass judgment on when a seeker had "got through" and would keep any about whom they had doubt, coming to the altar till they, the elders, were satisfied. When a notoriously shallow trifler named Bill announced at the close of the first service of a series that he had received the blessing of a new life the leaders replied: "Not you, Bill. That's too fast. You'll have to come forward again." Which he did—every night till the end of a week. Cadman saw some survivals of the old Methodist custom of "singing to the grave"—the triumphant procession of Methodists as they sang hymns of victory, following the dead body of any one of their number to the grave. In Cadman's day this had for the most part given way to the custom of bringing the plain coffin out of the house

and placing it on a table, on a "fair white cloth," and there singing the great hymns of triumph. Even the Shropshire miners who were not at all interested in religion won from Cadman a respect which he never lost. Roughest of the rough, they had their own code of morals which they strictly observed. For example, though they were not orthodox in sexual conduct, they did not give themselves to promiscuity as we think of it. As long as a man and woman lived together, whether with or without marriage license, they were loyal to each other and parted by mutual consent. This may not be highly moral, but it is better than the laxity which takes no account of the obligations of union at all. It is odd that many of the social classes which we look upon as lacking in opportunity and privilege often today have this same standard, while some so-called higher groups—higher in material and social standing—explore to the full the possibilities of a promiscuity which accepts no bonds whatever.

Doctor Cadman never apologized for the hardships of his early years—stern as they were. He used to speak with an amused contempt of an English family one of whose finest members, like himself, had started in the mines. Cadman years ago published a tribute to the character of this good and strong man only to be given to understand by the descendants, rich through the efforts of their ancestor, that they did not enjoy having the world told of the lowliness of the family beginning. The displeasure of the relatives, however, was more than matched by the glee of Cadman at this outcome.

During the days in the mines, young "Sam" began to show an interest in something besides mining, faithful worker though he was. He read everything he could lay his hands on and tried to school himself in the elements of Latin and Greek—in odd moments when he was waiting for a mine car to come—chalking declension and conjugation on the face of the coal seam. Methodist friends found out about all this somehow and made it possible for him to enter Richmond College, where he completed his formal education just about fifty years ago. The rest of the story belongs chiefly to America and at least in outline is known and read of hosts of men.

Cadman recognized as did every one else that his main strength was in public speech. He kept the emphasis there in all his work. For years he used every available minute of his time in reading and writing. He read widely, especially in English and American literature and history, with, as

the old-timers liked to say, "a memory as tenacious as a tar-barrel." The reading was limited to English. Once caught in the rush of activities like his he felt that it would slow him down to attempt much German or French, and so he kept to the beaten English paths. The greater historians, the master novelists, like Dickens and Thackeray and Meredith, were his constant companions. He knew well the perils of such wide reading accompanied as it was with a fluency of speech like his. So he sought to control his torrential utterance by unending reliance upon his pen. The style always revealed the sweep and velocity of his mind. It moved too fast always to be crystal-clear. His speech was too much of a cataract for that. He himself characterized it as rather "cryptic." Changing the figure, the faster the wheel is turning, the harder it is to see the spokes.

Some criticism of his form of utterance began to appear early in his ministry, at which it may be instructive to look for a moment. The most common was that it was not easy to carry away much of his sermons. This is fair but is not altogether relevant. For the strength of the Cadman preaching lay not merely in what was said, but also in the drenching of the receiving mind by the streams of speech. Here is what would happen year in and year out at Central Congregational Church, Brooklyn. Sunday by Sunday over two thousand persons would come to the church, out of the work of the week. These persons were not especially interested in theological discussion—certainly not in theological debate. They came with their souls dried up. For thirty or forty minutes they were swept along in a maelstrom's utterance which ministered to the best part of their lives. They were not listening to an appeal but were caught in a current to which they gladly surrendered themselves. It was not just the contagion of physical vitality—though that was there. It was not just an intellectual quickening—though that was there. It was not just moral challenge—though that was there, splendidly there. This was all these and more—the outpouring of a life which had touched the centers of life—those unseen centers where the divine abides. The hearers may not have carried away much of the sermon, but they carried away larger and better selves than they took into the church.

Again it was said of Doctor Cadman that he was too prone to making rapid generalizations. It must be admitted that at first hearing many of his statements seemed to warrant this objection—but not on second reflection. When, for instance, he was summing up the argument of a book, let

us say, he was without a superior in his ability to sketch the main idea of the author and to hit off the spirit and the style. There is no sin in generalization if the generalizing is thorough and just. All the Cadman generalities, if we choose to call them that, were based on wide and sound information. He once dashed off the remark that it would not do to disparage episcopacy overmuch—that it must not be forgotten that the majority of Christians since Christianity began had lived under an episcopal system of one form or another, and that a system with such survival power must have worth in it no matter how inadequate or faulty this or that particular episcopacy, or bishop, might be. Just what is wrong in a generalization like that? Again, thirty years ago, he and I went to a meeting called by certain municipal officials in Brooklyn to protest against traffic conditions at Brooklyn Bridge. Quite a number of us spoke but Cadman was the only one who said anything. The strength of what he said lay in his mastery of the peculiar traffic conditions, due to the configuration of Manhattan, responsible for the rush-hour jam at the bridge. Every hearer at once realized that Doctor Cadman had seized upon factors which must be dealt with before there could be much change for the better—factors of which nobody else seemed to be aware.

Another objection was that he carried an air of omniscience in what he said, especially in his radio and newspaper answers to questions. A sparkling columnist in a New York journal once avowed that in this cosmic express train which is bearing us all on from one eternity to another, Doctor Cadman must have been in the baggage car while humility was being served to the other passengers in the dining car. Here again there is abundant reason for the first impression. Cadman was always positive. His mind grasp was like his hand grasp, always firm and forceful. Well, even if he overdid the firmness and positiveness and definiteness, it must not be lost sight of that he was speaking in a time when most proclaimers of moral and spiritual conceptions were hesitant and wavering and apologetic. Inasmuch as Cadman always spoke out of sincere conviction, it was a tonic to have him around, positiveness and all. Moreover, before finding fault with the so-called omniscience it might have been just as well if the critic had paid heed to what the speaker had said. I was once surprised to see that in one of his forums Doctor Cadman had disposed of a most terrifying question in fifty words—the number in a telegram of moderate length—What are space and time? When I read the answer, however, I found it

compendious if not complete. It was good philosophy and quite long enough for the purpose. If the questioner understood what it meant, he had a sound start, anyway.

The query is sometimes raised as to the progressiveness of Cadman. Here we have to deal with a temper and attitude rather than with direct utterances which can be cited and quoted. Cadman came to this country when the debate on the Higher Criticism was getting warm. He had had the advantage in England of sounder biblical instruction than had most men in the Methodist circles which he entered here. Having made his own adjustment, he was more at ease than most others and reassured scores of the preachers by his unruffled steadiness. The newer methods he took as tools and used them as tools, without saying overmuch about them. When it came to the weightier matters, like the nature of God, he would not allow himself to be softened down to a weak liberalism. In the days just before the World War, we had in this country a tendency to a silly optimism which taught that God was to be conceived of in terms of smiles—rather inane smiles at that. The world was to be looked upon as hopelessly pleasant and getting more so. After listening to a lot of this stuff at an important ministerial gathering, Doctor Cadman broke out that the whole tendency of the discussion was to take all the heroically moral qualities out of our doctrine of God and make Him less admirable morally than any woman who had ever borne a child. Still he would not have God thought of as expressed in an iron-clad law. He believed in a moral God, who would go the last step to give men the largest and finest life. In Fundamentalism, as such, he had no interest.

As to progressiveness in social questions, we must remember that S. Parkes Cadman was reared in the Methodist tradition that religion is primarily an affair of an individual and his God, and that God reveals His favor to men when they utilize the practical witness of honesty and faithfulness and thrift in daily work. He took the present social system about as he found it and sought to put it to the best purposes. He never paid much attention to problems like those posed by Marxianism, but, accepting the capitalistic scheme as here, he insisted that capitalism must be constantly setting its house in order. It is a fact, probably more significant than at first appears, that capitalism in this country at least has not yet produced any defenders worth listening to. The capitalist takes his system as inherently good and "jams it through." Probably his intellectual



strength is so sucked out of him by his business that he does not have enough force left to think about the social consequences of his business. It is conceivable that a better defense of a capitalistic order could be built up on selections taken here and there from the pages of Karl Marx than we ever hear from the lips of capitalists themselves. I once went with Doctor Cadman to hear a defense of the present industrial and financial order by a man widely heralded as one of the foremost business men in the United States. We had to endure nearly an hour of arid and barren piffle on which the Cadman comment was that the speaker's intentions were of the best.

In the basic qualities of regard for men as men Cadman was superb. He was spiritually of the English liberalism of Gladstone in his palmy days. His attitude toward war is also well known. Here, too, he had to listen to defenses of war which hardly rose to the dignity of anything intellectual but remained on the plane of the sub-mental.

The people who like to ask what would have been the result if something else had happened than what did happen, puzzle themselves with the problem as to what would have happened to Cadman if he had remained in the Methodist church. Whatever might have happened, he very likely would not have had the field in Methodism that he found in Central Church. He worked best by himself. No ecclesiastical position could have added to his strength, and no Methodist pulpit thirty years ago could have given him the sphere that Central Church gave. As it was he was more of a leader of Methodist preachers than any preacher I have known in my time. It is noteworthy that he had a larger, finer appreciation of American Methodism than have most Methodists. He came to this country prepared to be impressed. The first time he saw a certain Methodist bishop of imposing bearing, he said that he felt as if he stood in the presence of a reincarnated John Wesley. There was for young S. Parkes a disillusionment when before that Conference session was over the new arrival from England saw that that bishop was more John than Wesley. Cadman too had to get used to the way Methodist preachers act when they are together. At the same Conference of which I have just spoken a prominent brother, rather too clever in political manipulation, found it necessary to defend himself before the Conference. He began his speech by saying in a stage whisper: "Brethren, you are listening to the words of a dying man." The young Cadman was deeply touched. Observing his emotion an older minister



whispered: "Save your tears for five minutes. By that time you can hear him a block away." Now what I wish to say is that while Cadman did not find as many saints in Methodist Conferences as he had expected, he found what is more important—hosts of good men. He saw the less worthy sides of these men but he never became sour or cynical or discouraged about them. His first attitude toward ministers of all faiths was that they were morally and spiritually sound, and he seldom had cause to revise his judgment.

He came to be the trusted counsellor of hundreds of men. To all he was a ready and kindly listener. To any preacher who in his pulpit utterances speaks with the spiritual authority of one who knows Christ, men in trouble flock with all sorts and conditions of personal troubles. If all the interviews of such nature that Doctor Cadman heard could be published they would make a most revealing cross-section of the social and moral story not merely of thousands of individuals, but of the inner side of the life of one of the greatest cities of the world during a third of a century. Naturally not as much is known of Cadman's work as a pastor as of his pulpit achievements, but the pastoral accomplishments were very great. He would arrive home on Friday from a week of lecturing in the central west. His morning sermon for the coming Sunday would have been written in the Pullman on the way. Saturday morning his car would be early at his door to take him on a hard day of pastoral tasks which might involve seeing fifty people before night. Now it might be supposed that a call under such circumstances would be just a quick dart into a house and out, but not so. The call could not be long, but it was packed full of enkindling and contagious vitality. It was marked by a ready seizure of a situation, quick response of sympathy, almost instantaneous utterance of the right word. If the call was breezy, it was breezy with freshness of life. The heart of this man was as immediately responsive to calls upon his sympathy as was his mind to a suddenly appearing crisis demanding fast thinking and ready speech.

Doctor Cadman was not among those preachers who disparage pastoral work. I have said that his pulpit utterances drew to him men in trouble. In meeting those troubles, he laid hold of vast stores of experience heaped up in incessant visitation. The bright men who belittle such work are not always as bright as they themselves assume. For it is high presumption, not to say conceit, in a minister to believe that without any intimate knowl-

edge of the lives before him, of the peculiar temptations they meet, and the difficulties they have to confront, he can preach to their deeper needs. In one way or another the preacher has to perform the priestly function of taking on himself the mistakes and tragedies of his followers. Here is really the strain in any ministry worthy of the name. No administrative position can compare in draft upon a minister's nervous reserves with any church of considerable size. The better the church is "running" the heavier the drain. The pastor has to deal with the dying, the sick, the down-and-outs, the defeated and the failures. To go dashing through such zones of spiritual climate requires inexhaustible reservoirs of sympathetic insight and understanding—and Cadman had them. He was a master in the art of finding new places for men who had blundered—but who had it in them to do better next time. The confidential stories that man kept locked in his own mind! I remember an incident years ago of the grievous indiscretion of a minister who though not technically guilty of any moral wrong was nevertheless being pushed about from pillar to post by Methodist officials till he had nearly lost heart. Cadman knew the situation intimately and finally went to the late Bishop Andrews with it. The Bishop heard Cadman through and forthwith found an adequate field for the erring brother. When the members of the Conference started in to protest, the Bishop simply said: "The brother has been punished enough. I accept Doctor Cadman's view. The appointment stands." Victims of drink, of domestic tragedy, of moral overstrain knew the Cadman charitableness in full measure. As I left the church after the funeral service on July 15, I saw standing near the entrance a once-prominent Brooklyn citizen who for yielding to tremendous temptation in a city office had spent a term in Sing Sing. I knew why this man was there.

Of Doctor Cadman as an administrator of church enterprises it is not necessary to speak at length. He was eminently successful in the presidency of the Federal Council, especially in widening the circle of the Council's influence. It pleased him immensely to be called to the presidency of the Council directly from the pastorate—the first minister to be thus called that I now remember. He re-enforced the standing of the Council in its larger decision especially. It was during his term that the pressure of the Council on Congress and other government officials kept this country out of war with Mexico.

All of the above had to do with the more massive sides of the Cad-

man nature. There were finer sides—especially revealing themselves in a love for beauty in whatever form. A listener to his disquisitions on china might soon be overwhelmed at his detailed knowledge of what constituted beauty in a plate or cup. There are some finely wrought iron adornments in a gate to one of London's parks. Of their somewhat sombre beauty he could not say enough—though this enthusiasm may have been partly due to the fact that the gates had been forged and hammered in the neighborhood of his birthplace. There are some effects on the under side of sea waves breaking in the sunlight to which he used to like to call attention, with the remark that Tennyson was the only poet who seemed to have noticed them. He always stood entranced at the way of a ship in the sea. He rejoiced in the colors of Oriental rugs, in the delicate shadings of Japanese prints, in the character interpretations of Salisbury's portrait paintings, in the pictures with which Du Maurier illustrated Trilby. He often said that some passages of Thackeray thrilled him so profoundly that he would have to put the book down and cease reading—for example the chapter in *The Newcomes* entitled: "In which Mr. Newcome Answers Adsum when his Name is Called."

Deeper than all this was the quick responsiveness of his will when moral issues appeared. He did not wait to see what others would do before he took his own stand. His conscience did not hang fire when confronted with anything having to do with his loyalty to his friends, or to the truth, or to the Church, or to his Christ. What seemed to some like brusqueness in expression of decisions was actually a swift and sure response to duty. He thought it a bad sign when a moral leader had to consider sure calls to duty for too long a time. To anything lacking in moral high-tone he was in opposition at once. Through his long term of service did anyone ever hear him charged with any form of meanness? Did anyone ever hear any accusation against his character even in the days when he had come to the full light of a nationwide publicity?

The rush of the Cadman energies was so immense that one might imagine that all that he did was without effort or strain. So far as outward activity was concerned this was largely true. The machine ran so easily and smoothly that it seemed impossible to stop it. The inner life, however, knew its stresses. As to fundamentals, Doctor Cadman's mind was not given to doubt, but constitutionally he was subject to severe seasons of depression. It is often true that buoyant natures pass through periods

when stale, flat and unprofitable seem all the uses of this weary world. It is commonplace too that humor as fine and radiant as that of our friend hangs like a bright cloud over melancholy darkness. Whether it was a congenital peculiarity, or recollection of early hardships, or the result of brooding over the inexplicable tragedies which his work forced upon him day by day, Doctor Cadman knew depression in its blackness and bitterness. At the great meeting in Albert Hall, London, in 1932, at the moment when the three branches of Methodism were united into one, some surge of mental distress came upon him so strongly that he had to rise and leave the assembly. The mood was indeed succeeded by a sense of triumph which blazed forth that same night in an address in which he looked forward to a reunion of all branches of the Christian Church—a brave note, which no one else sounded in all the sessions of that great occasion for it specifically included Roman Catholicism—a note all the braver from the characteristic frankness which added that if any such union with Roman Catholicism came about America and not England would have to take the lead.

At the time of his death, Doctor Cadman was under agreement to deliver an address on "Bunyan and the Pilgrim's Progress" at a meeting of ministers to be held in Evanston, Illinois, next December. That fact and its inner fitness prompt me to quote here from the famous passage of Bunyan—*Mr. Valiant-for-Truth Crosses the River*.

"After this it was noised abroad that Mr. Valiant-for-Truth was taken with a summons. . . . Then said he: I am going to my Father's. . . . I give my courage and skill to him that can get it. . . . When the day that he must go hence was come, many accompanied him to the River side, into which, as he went he said: Death, where is thy sting? As he went down deeper he said: Grave, where is thy victory. So he passed over, and the Trumpets sounded for him on the other side."

## God in History

EDGAR P. DICKIE

A FAITH which rests *only* on history will not stand against the *facts* of history. The only thing that can overcome the world is that which cannot be explained in terms of the world. Christianity rests on history, but it cannot be explained in terms of history alone.

A curious remark is made by Ernst Troeltsch (in his article "Historiography" in Hastings' E. R. E.). He affirms that Christianity revived the mythological representation of history. "The early Christian conception of mankind, alike as regards time and as regards space, was narrow in the extreme. . . . The history of the human race . . . was saturated with mythology; in the middle stood the miracle of the Incarnation and the rise of the Church. Interest was once more concentrated upon the inexplicable."

There are two strange misunderstandings in that passage. The first is to suppose that there can be any narrowness in the conception of divine holy love. The greater part of the New Testament was written, not by theologians, but by missionaries. For one of these at least his parish was the world. There could be for them no narrow conception of mankind. "A thing of price is man, because for him Christ died" (Synesius).

The second strange misunderstanding is to suppose that history can disregard the inexplicable. The gospel accounts of the birth and life and death of Jesus are "anchors in the actual." But what if that actual should prove to be precisely that which can overcome the world, because it is inexplicable in terms of the world? History cannot really be indifferent to that question.

Tyrrell prophesied that Christianity would one day be reduced to "mysticism and charity," having broken free from the shackles of historical happenings. And it may always be difficult to reconcile timeless truth with the historical medium by which it is conveyed. The limit of time is what Lessing called it, "an ugly ditch." "Accidental truths of history," he thought "can never be evidence for necessary truths of reason." Herrmann expressed it (*Communion with God*, English Translation, pp. 60ff.). "It is a fatal drawback that no historical judgment, however certain it may

appear, ever attains anything more than probability. . . . The basis of our faith must be something fixed: the results of historical study are continually changing."

Naturally, Christianity is the faith which is most profoundly affected by this problem. It is everywhere rooted in history. Three particular forms of this dependence are to be noticed.

1. *The Old Testament.* Christianity at the outset possessed a sacred book which it accepted as inspired, and as revealing the nature of the God who was worshiped. This book presents certain historical events, personalities, and institutions, and the claim is made that these have, not a relative, but a unique value in connection with the divine revelation. In this book there are promises and warnings, laws, ritual, and psalms of praise, but everything is set in the framework of one people's history. Moreover, this history is set forth as the history of all mankind; Jahveh is the God, not of Israel only, but of the race. With its fulfillment in the New Testament, we have the conception of a unified process, beginning with creation, passing through the fall in Adam, and moving on to redemption by Christ, and the final return of the Redeemer to judgment (cf. C. C. J. Webb: *The Historical Element in Religion*, pp. 37ff., 80ff.). It is plain therefore that historical criticism, as it has developed in our own time, presents a very difficult problem. A revolution in Christian thought was occasioned by the entrance of Copernican astronomy; and another by the advances in biology, leading to the doctrines of evolution. But, in the application to the biblical writings of the methods employed in criticism of secular literature, we see the greatest of all revolutions. "The application to these of principles accepted everywhere else as applicable to the study of ancient literature has brought about . . . a revolution, than which Christianity has probably known none more complete—though others have been more spectacular, because accompanied by greater changes in ecclesiastical organization and in the external forms of worship and piety—since the Church was compelled to abandon the expectation of her Master's return in the lifetime of the generation which had seen Him in the flesh" (op. cit., p. 81).

2. A second form of the dependence of Christianity on history is seen in the way in which the divine revelation is mediated. God communicates His will through historical personalities (the prophets) and entrusts His revelation to a *historical community*. Of first-rate importance to the



Christian is the record of the past of that community to which he belongs. It is true that God has not left Himself anywhere without a witness, but, for the Christian, His revelation through the prophets and through the religious community of Israel is unique. In other communities, there is not to be observed the same steady and consistent advance; "isolated spots of light appear, but surrounded by impenetrable darkness" (H. R. Mackintosh: *The Christian Apprehension of God*, chapter 3).

3. The third respect in which Christianity is dependent on history is that which marks out this religion from all others, namely, its deification of its historical Founder, the apotheosis of an earthly life *within the confines of monotheism*. ("To hold that the founder of one's religion is a god is of course common enough. But in Christianity the historical Founder is regarded not as a god but as God in the strict sense which the word bears to a monotheist, nay, to a Jewish monotheist, the first article of whose faith is 'Thy God is One' and the first commandment of his code the precept to have no gods beside that One."—C. C. J. Webb, op. cit., p. 44.)

Let us first of all make this point, that the two historical elements already referred to (the Old Testament as a sacred book, and the prophets and community as mediums of revelation) are quite transformed in their significance by consideration of this third feature. Scripture becomes something quite different when seen from its culmination in the life and teaching of Jesus. Again, the history of Israel is seen in its true perspective only from the point in which it culminates. Its interpretation lies in its fulfillment. It is easy, perhaps, to argue that no historical fact recorded in the Old Testament can be of more than relative significance; that we might, in some newly-discovered histories of forgotten peoples, find a better account of God's dealings with the world; but the plausibility of the argument vanishes when we reach the peak of this historical revelation—in Jesus. Everything falls into place. If God is what we see Him to be in Jesus, then it is His nature to reveal the absolute truth about Himself by historical means.

Secondly, concerning the personalities of the prophets and the entrusting of the divine revelation to a particular community. These factors are seen in their right significance only from the culminating point in Jesus. We recall the striking words at the end of Otto's *The Idea of the Holy*, words which, in their effect, seem to contradict in large measure the rest of the book: "We can look beyond the prophet, to One in whom is found the



spirit in all its plenitude, and who at the same time in His person and in His performance is become most completely the object of divination, in whom Holiness is recognized apparent.

"Such a One is more than Prophet. He is the Son."

Now it is at least *conceivable* that only through prophets and through communal revelation can men understand the Son when He comes in the fullness of time. And the Christian contention is that it is not merely conceivable but that this is the actual way of God's working. It might seem easy to say that the prophets and the community have only relative value; that others have been found or may yet be found of equal significance; but the Christian claim is that the force of this argument fails when we look on prophets and community from the culmination in Jesus. *History, in itself relative, is found to have absolute significance by its reference to the Person of Christ.*

All history, we must believe, is under the control of God. It is true that we must also find room for the reality of the moral struggle, but there is more than "a fighting chance" of history's going in the direction of God's will. He can turn even rebellion to His purpose. In the prophets we have always the chance that they may prove unfaithful to their vocation. Probably many did prove unfaithful. There were lying prophets as well as genuine ones. But this does not disturb the final plans of God. As He can turn even rebellion to His purpose, so He can teach His lessons, by contrast, even through the lying spirits by which the unfaithful prophets are informed. In truth, it is in the religion of Israel and in the Person of Christ that we see that portion of the historic process which *has fulfilled* the divine plan. It is this which makes it absolute in significance.

All comes down, therefore, in the end, to this third way in which the Christian religion is dependent on the historical.

The teaching and the life of Jesus cannot be taken as only exemplifications of a truth which is timeless. If, says Professor Webb, a Christian should say, "It matters not who taught this—I thought it was Jesus, but I may be mistaken about that—it is the teaching itself that matters," then he is not a Christian in the only possible sense of that term. Similarly, if he declares, "Perhaps Jesus did not live thus, but this is the kind of life that I see it is best to live," again he is not true to the most characteristic feature of Christianity (cf. op. cit., pp. 77, 78). "The death and resurrection of this Person and the life which was the prelude thereto become thus not

mere exemplifications of timeless realities, but the actual vehicles of the divine presence and certificates to Christians of their power to recognize it and to count upon it" (op. cit., p. 48).

It was this very feature of Christianity which gave it the decisive advantage over Mithraism. That rival faith could offer only a divine hero who belonged to mythical antiquity, and could even be identified with the sun in the heavens. Biographies rightly weigh more with men than romances (cf. Wood, op. cit., p. xxvii). Yet today it appears that the anchorage in history which gave to Christianity one feature of its superiority over its rivals, has now become a disadvantage, a stumbling-block, a perplexing problem of Christian apologetics.

The gospel is intimately bound up with fact. "The passion and exaltation of Christ is neither symbol nor allegory, but a story of *what has been done* for men by a real man, who was also something more than man, the story of a real *transaction* at once divine and human" (A. E. Taylor: *Faith of a Moralist*, II, p. 117).

What we may call the first position of Troeltsch in this matter (*Die Absolutheit des Christentums und die Religionsgeschichte*—1909) may be summarized thus: He discounts the naïve claim to validity which is made by all religions, simply because their view is confined to their own horizon. Next, he rejects the attempts to establish the supreme claim of any religion by evidence of the miraculous, including under this term not simply those "nature-miracles" which involve an infringement of natural law, but also the "miracles of interior conversion and the attainment of a higher quality of life through communion with Jesus and His community" (Troeltsch: *Christian Thought: Its History and Application*, p. 9). But Troeltsch rejects no less summarily what he calls the concept of evolution, according to which, as in Hegel's view, Christianity is simply the perfected expression of religion as such. This view must be set aside. Christianity is a particular, independent historical principle.

Troeltsch considered that he had found a solution. The validity which is claimed for Christianity rests on the fine point of personal conviction. We require a broader foundation in actual objective facts. He believed that he had discovered such a foundation in the very nature of the claim to validity. "It does not depend in any way upon human reflection or a laborious process of reasoning, but upon an overwhelming manifestation of God in the persons and lives of the great prophets."

Troeltsch felt that he had escaped the antithesis of relativism and absolutism (cf. A. C. Bouquet: *Is Christianity the Final Religion?*, p. 202). What he envisaged was the steady pursuit of an absolute goal in and through the relative. Absolute value lies, not in history, but in the future of history. There *might* be a higher revelation than that given in Jesus, but the personal conviction of Christian people declares that a new, higher religion is utterly impossible. That, he says, is as far as we have any right to go. To wish to have the Absolute in history, in an absolute form at one single point, is a piece of foolishness.

If these last words mean simply that in Jesus we see, not God, but God incarnate, we should agree. But the words mean much more than that. They mean that the Absolute has appeared only in such a limited way as is possible at the contemporary stage of man's advance. They make the absolute appearance dependent on man's capability of apprehending. This is quite unwarranted. It is not surprising that, in his last writings, Troeltsch was forced to go much further. In an essay, published posthumously in 1923 (*Christian Thought: Its History and Application*, first chapter) he is much more radical. He was right in insisting that Christianity cannot give up its historical anchorage, or interpret the Person of Jesus as merely a symbol, but what he did not realize was this, that in these realms history *may* be faced by the inexplicable: that the spectator-attitude is not adequate in dealing with these facts. The historian cannot have the deciding word about the Jesus of past history unless he has also the requisite evidence concerning the Jesus of present experience, and this he cannot have without faith. "The truth is," says Professor D. M. Baillie, "that without faith no man can be a good historian of religious matters" (*Faith in God and Its Christian Consummation*, p. 226).

This fact always escaped Troeltsch, and hence he passed to his later position. Undoubtedly, he says, it is the profound inner experience which is the criterion of our faith's validity, but, be it noted, only of its validity *for us*. "It is God's countenance as revealed to us; it is the way in which, being what we are, we receive, and react to, the revelation of God." This does not preclude the possibility of other racial groups making a similar claim. "Who will presume to make a really final pronouncement here? Only God Himself, who has determined these differences, can do that" (*Christian Thought*, p. 27).

Von Hügel, commenting on this passage, refers to the curious con-

ception of a chameleon-like truth which, though polymorphous, is nevertheless taken by Troeltsch to be Truth and Life in very deed (*ibid.*, p. xxx). "Midas," he says, "died of hunger from his fatal gift of turning all he touched into gold; so also Troeltsch, *qua* vehement individualist, finds himself incapable of deriving spiritual force and food from those entrancing historical perspectives which everywhere arise under his magical touch" (*ibid.*, p. xxxiii).

For our purpose, the important point is this—Troeltsch dismisses *a priori* the possibility of the Absolute's appearing in history. This dismissal is quite indefensible. He himself declares that there is no proof of continual progress. If that is true, the Absolute need not be "the future of history"; there is no reason whatever for saying that it cannot appear at one point in the stream of history. Development, certainly, there may be, but development in man's apprehension of what was given once for all. We can imagine nothing greater than divine holy love as revealed in the life and death and resurrection of Jesus. Troeltsch confuses the final apprehension of the truth that is given in Jesus with that truth itself. There is nothing to indicate that this absolute truth cannot be given—even though the understanding and apprehending of it may not yet be achieved.

Johannes Wendland (*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*—1914—quoted Bouquet, *op. cit.*, p. 252) rightly says, "Faith has therefore good grounds for continuing to believe that a higher than the Christian gospel cannot be conceived, and that it is the goal of all history, so that all nations will come at length to recognize Jesus as the Lord and Mediator of their faith." "Even the ancient civilized peoples of Asia will have not merely to complete those things in their equipment which seem resemblances to Christianity, but also in addition to the approximations and syncretisms which will probably not be wanting, consciously accept the Person of Jesus as the full expression of those elements of truth which were already in their midst." They need not merely education and uplifting but also conversion to Christ.

It is clear that, in spite of the comprehensive and illuminating studies made by Troeltsch, the whole question stands today in need of re-examination.

Other religions have their center in an *imperative*. They say: Exercise yourself in the Buddhist meditation, and you will attain to Nirvana. Or they say: Fast and pray and obey the commandments, and you will

help to bring in the kingdom of God (Karl Heim: *Glaube und Leben*, p. 432). Or it may be that a faith presents an *optative*, an εἰθε γένουτο, as in the Messianic hope. But Christianity is centered on an *indicative*, and a perfect indicative. Pure *facts*, quite independent of that which man may do or say or hope or think, placed the world in a new situation.

Let us see how those people fare who dispense with the indicative. There is no inevitability of progress, they say. History may be retrograde. It is well, therefore, to sever religion completely from history, to cut it off "with a hatchet." They do not find God at all in the process of history; its vacillations offer to them no secure foundation for faith. On the one side, they are deeply conscious of the difficulty involved in determining precisely what happened at any period in the past; and, on the other, they see no guarantee that the true and the righteous will be perpetuated by the course of history or the false and the evil overcome. *Facts*, they say, cannot be certainly ascertained, and *values* are not inevitably preserved. They feel no confidence in the house of the historical. But they have an inner citadel into which they can retreat, and there be safe. The mystical experience is something which is wholly unaffected by the flux of time. Here, they feel, is timeless truth. It is an eternal possession which the vicissitudes of history cannot alter.

There are, however, certain difficulties which this position cannot meet. 1. If it is *Christian* mysticism, then it *must* take history seriously. The God with whom the mystic is in touch is God the Father of Jesus; the God fully and finally revealed in the Jesus of history. The Christian communion is not with an ideal Christ, but with Christ incarnate, crucified, risen. 2. If it is *non-Christian* mysticism, it can escape from the necessity of taking into account the anchorage of faith in a historic happening. It can take refuge in denying the ultimate reality of that which "takes place." It may pretend not to take history seriously. But, as a matter of fact, history will not be dismissed even here. There are two sides to the experience of communion. It is quite possible to claim that one of these two sides, the divine, is timeless, and out of history. But that claim cannot be made for the other side. The experience is possible only in a *center* of experience. The nature of this center, this ego, is historically determined. It is an "I" which has had such and such a history; an "I" also which is what it is because of its share in the life of a certain community. The mystic's experience would be different if his own history had been differ-

ent. And the influence of his community would be different if *its* past had been different. In fact, the form of the experience is determined by the whole past course of human history. The man who tries to offer a faith which has no dependence on history is attempting the impossible. He must begin with experiences such as this, and all of them must be historically conditioned. All the evidence that is available for him is evidence shot through and through with history.

The mystic's religion is not always so independent of history as he makes out. Even the language employed would frequently be unintelligible apart from the historic process by which his religion came to him. The Christian is bound to preserve both—the historical in the mystical and the mystical in the historical. (1) The Christ with whom the mystic can describe himself as being *ἐν χριστῷ* is that One who was the Jesus of Nazareth. (2) The Jesus of history, *rightly understood*, is the Jesus who cannot but be the living and eternal Christ.

The historic Jesus is also the present Christ, the contemporary of us all.

Of this central thought there is a valuable philosophical treatment in Karl Heim's *Jesus der Herr*. The first Christians believed that they had living fellowship with One who was no longer on the earth. At one time that belief might have been set aside as the delusion of people who did not understand the limits of personal intercourse. But, says Heim, the modern philosophy of the "I" and the "Thou" has removed any *metaphysical* objection. We now know that the essence of the I-Thou relation need not exclude that of persons who are not historically contemporary. We see the mistake of reducing the Thou-relation to the level of an It-relation. Metaphysically, the conception of intercourse or estrangement, near or far, between a you and a me has nothing necessarily to do with proximity or separation in space or time (*Jesus der Herr*, pp. 214ff.). Luther and Goethe were better understood by posterity than by their historical contemporaries. In this new "Dimension" we must be prepared for altogether new possibilities.

Mr. H. G. Wood calls attention to a passage in Professor A. E. Taylor's Gifford Lectures: "In the world of intelligent human action, the remembered past seems to be able to mold the future directly and immediately, striking, so to say, out of its remote pastness, even though there has been no continuous persistence of itself or its effects through the interval,"



and he adds that we cannot confine the influence of the creative events recorded in the New Testament to the channels in which we can trace the continuous persistence of such influence. Nothing can prevent Saint Paul's speaking directly to kindred spirits through the generations, however embarrassing the response of Marcion, or Augustine, or Luther, or John Wesley, or Karl Barth may appear to be (Wood, op. cit., pp. 25, 26). In a sense it is true, as Croce insists, that all history is contemporary.

This is in line with the verdict of the religious consciousness. Our indicative is not simply "Jesus was born, lived, died, rose again," but also "God speaks through Him to me now, and deals with my life in such and such a way." "It is found," says Professor H. R. Mackintosh, "that Jesus is only past while we refuse to think of Him. Let the supreme issues be taken up in moral earnest and at once He steps forward from the page of history, a tremendous and exacting reality" (*Some Aspects of Christian Belief*, p. 12).

There are thus three points which must be kept in view if the relation of Christianity to history is not to be obscured.

1. Christianity begins with an indicative—not a doctrine of monotheism, but a new act or word of the one living God; not a belief in Messianism, but an actual Messiah; not a Pharisaic doctrine of resurrection but a risen Person (Wood, op. cit., p. 66). (It is not without significance that the indicative is absent from the later essay of Troeltsch. Its title is *The Place of Christianity Among the World Religions* [*Die Stellung des Christentums unter den Weltreligionen*], but in the whole course of the lecture the name of Jesus is not mentioned.)

2. It is not even with an indicative that we are concerned, but with this particular indicative. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself" (2 Corinthians 5. 19).

3. This historical figure is also the contemporary of all generations.

It is clear that the Hegelian dialectic is out of place here. It does not provide for or interpret the new creation which takes place in history. The course of history is not simply the natural unfolding of what is implicit in man from the outset. "To affirm, as Hegel did, that the whole wealth of historic development is potential in the beginnings of mind, is a statement which it would be impossible to justify historically. The lesson of history is rather that at certain times men of genius initiate new movements which, though related to the past, are not explained by it" (Galloway:



*Philosophy of Religion*, p. 446). There is much more than the development of that which was implicit from the outset. There are crises, creative moments, the results of which cannot be foretold nor, when they are determined, explained by what has preceded them. Nor can we any longer hold to the belief in the *inevitability* of progress which satisfied many minds in the last century. There is no system of human evolution which will, without fail, produce generations of mankind in an ever-ascending series of amelioration. Many are content with the superficial confidence that there is such a law at work; the humanist will have it that civilization tends inevitably upwards. Turgenieff declared, "I believe in civilization and I require no further creed" (quoted in Webb, *Religion in Contemporary Thought*, p. 50). That faith received a mortal blow from the outbreak of the European War in 1914. There is in civilization no inherent upward tendency. Its gains have to be preserved by endless vigilance and strife, or, as the religious man prefers to put it, they are granted by God in reward of faithfulness and obedience.

The Hegelian dialectic is out of place. It is equally clear, I think, that the Barthian dialectic is inadequate. History, Barth would say, reveals God's abrupt No to man's affirmation. To Christianity, history is a very different thing from history as it appears to any other religion or philosophy.

Barth, in his *Dogmatik* (I. I. 2d edition, p. 333) declares again that it is not for its history that we value the Bible. Events of far greater moment took place in Greece and Rome. Petty wars with the Amalekites and the Philistines dwindle into insignificance when we compare them with other happenings in the world.

But this, surely, is to take a *very* narrow view of what is meant by "history." No one would nowadays be inclined to say that history consists in chronicling events and nothing more—battles, accessions, the rise and fall of dynasties, and the like. History includes, in addition, the story of the reactions of men to the events through which they pass. It is this which gives importance to biblical history. Indeed it is this which *makes* it history and not simply chronicles, *Annales*.

In the ordinary sense of the word, Brunner writes (*The Mediator*, p. 153), Christianity "is not concerned with history at all. It is what it is through its relation to a unique event, which, although it is a fact of history, does not gain its unique character from its historical connection. It is this which determines the peculiar relation of the Christian faith to history in

general. To the Christian faith, revelation does not mean a reverent process of tracing the ways of God in history. Indeed, history as such is not a divine revelation; it merely represents humanity as a whole in its need of redemption." Revelation is the breaking-in of God—as it were the disruption of the process of history. The Divine coming is not an *evolutio* but an *ingressio* (Barth: *Dogmatik*, I. 1st edition, p. 230).

This descent of God, "straight down from above" (*senkrecht von oben*) is a conception with which all may agree; but it is necessary further to examine the way in which it takes place. Does God's descent take account of the situation as it is? Or does it involve an abrupt cleavage, complete discontinuity between the new and the old?

The answer of the Theology of Crisis is given in the idea of *Urgeschichte* (a phrase taken from Franz Overbeck). It has been translated "pre-history" (Birch Hoyle), "super-history" (Camfield), "revelation-history" (McConnachie), "primal history" (Hoskyns). "Biblical history in the Old and New Testaments is not really history at all, but seen from above is a series of free divine acts and seen from below a series of fruitless attempts to undertake something in itself impossible" (Barth: *Das Wort Gottes*—E. T., *The Word of God and the Word of Man*, p. 72). When God enters, history ceases to be; something wholly different and new begins—a history with its own distinct grounds, possibilities, and hypotheses (p. 37). God breaks through from the eternal world into "this dim spot which men call earth" (cf. Birch Hoyle: *The Teaching of Karl Barth*).

I question whether much is gained by the conception of *Urgeschichte*. "The kingdom of God" it is said, "is not the goal of historical evolution, not the emergence of divine forces latent in the process of history. It is the new world of God, and must come, in and through the action of God Himself. The revelation event which betokens this is not therefore an historical but a super-historical, an *urgeschichtlich* event" (F. W. Camfield: *Revelation and the Holy Spirit*, p. 218). An historical movement has no value nor promise in itself. "Apart from the infusion into it of critical and creative power from without and from above, it deteriorates, hardens, turns to evil. This can be seen in all the great and beneficent movements of history. They have in spite of all their value a *nisus* toward evil and cannot be allowed to evolve through their own innate life and power. The evolution of history is *per se* the evolution of sin" (*ibid.*, p. 220).

I question whether this amounts to more than what will readily be granted, namely, that what is good in the process of the world's development is of God, from above.

"Every virtue we possess,  
And every victory won,  
And every thought of holiness,  
Are His alone."

It does not offer any help in investigating the manner in which God breaks through, the relation between the eternal world and the temporal process.

It is plain that the arriving of the divine movement in the world does *not* involve discontinuity. God is in control of the historical process at every point. When He intervenes, it is not a new situation that is created, but the old one transfigured. The unity and the character of God are enough by themselves to justify Christians in finding revelation in history. God is found "in the confirmation afforded by history that 'righteousness exalteth a nation'" (H. R. Mackintosh: *Christian Apprehension of God*, p. 96).

If we find *Urgeschichte* at every *crisis* of history (the point at which a movement coming down from God *arrives*) then we must find it also at every stage through which the crisis was prepared; in every right choice made by men, in every sincere prophet, in every beginning of an upward tendency, however infinitesimal. In fact, God is always and everywhere at work in history. Only, man does not always and everywhere recognize or accept Him. Divine forces *are* latent in history. Had they not been, history would have had a much more sorry tale to tell: would perhaps have ended long ago. If the evolution of history is the evolution of sin, it is also the story of redemption.

Certainly the unfolding of history has been characterized by wrong choices, wrong actions, wrong aims; and revelation cannot come (directly) through these (though it may come *out* of them by way of warning, or through the over-ruling of evil for good); but it does not greatly help to use the terms "historical" and "super-historical" when that which is signified is simply bad and good. In these simple terms there are problems enough to be tackled.

Admittedly, says Dean Matthews (*The Purpose of God*, p. 151), history presents us with "a wavering line and not with a rational curve, still

less with a straight upward path. What is the cause of that wavering? Not, I suggest, that the waverings as such are part of the divine plan, but rather that the possibility of wavering was an element in the design. The setbacks and disasters, the catastrophes which intervene and bring high promise to nothing, the more deadly slow decay of once vigorous civilizations, are partly due to that irrational element in human life which we may describe as 'chance.' But they are also due in part to the failure of persons and societies to respond to their vocation. . . . The course of history is studded with occasions when the future depended on whether a few individuals had the insight to see what might be done and the courage to do it, and with other occasions when the few who perceived the signs of the times could not make their vision effective in social action."

Every crisis has its antecedents. The Barthian is chiefly concerned with the *divine* side; history has to be acted on creatively by God. And, in this connection, *Urgeschichte* means little more than this, that there are degrees of revelation (or as Barth is compelled to put it, degrees of inspiration): that revelation is progressive and that it is dependent on the responsiveness of the human spirit. God does not give the next lesson till the last has been learned. *Geschichte* is simply God in history but unseen or defied. *Urgeschichte* is God in history recognized and accepted. The determining question for Christianity is not, Is Jesus *Geschichte* or *Urgeschichte*? The question is, Who *is* this who has appeared on earth, has lived and taught, was crucified and is risen? The term *Urgeschichte* is perhaps only a name to conceal our ignorance. It does appear as if the writers of Scripture, in any case, must have found God precisely where the Barthian says that God cannot be found—in history and in inner experience. (A more valuable part of the Barthian contribution will be considered later.)

The conception of history and super-history does not really meet the recurrent problem, the reconciliation of timeless truth with the historical medium by which it is conveyed. Mr. H. G. Wood suggests that the positive emphasis of Saint Paul is the wiser emphasis. God chooses the weak things of this world to confound the mighty (op. cit., p. 189). History is a domain in which God is bringing reality to pass. "God was at the helm," Augustine said "though very secretly." "History is such that salvation may come by way of it" (H. R. Mackintosh: *Some Aspects of Christian Belief*, p. 16). In a fine phrase of Professor Farmer, there is a divine pur-

pose "which is fashioning men in time for that which time cannot contain" (*The World and God*, p. 301).

We have seen that the Christian is bound to preserve both sides of his faith—the historical in the mystical and the mystical in the historical. In the first place, the Christ of our day-by-day communion is that One who was the Jesus of Nazareth. In the second place, the Jesus of history, rightly understood, is the Jesus who cannot but be the living and eternal Christ.

Here we must meet that important challenge which comes today from the school of Form Criticism. Much that was hitherto accepted as the authentic record of the acts performed by Jesus and the words spoken by Him may be the product of the early Christian community. Nor is it easy to set a limit to the amount of transference of material from one category to the other which may yet be demanded. As the community is in some sense the author of the story, may it not also be the hero? (Cf. Wood, op. cit., p. 40 and p. 70.)

There are indeed several weighty considerations which serve to minimize the importance of the results announced already by *Formgeschichte*. Its contention is that a very large proportion of the gospel records must be ascribed to creation by the community and a very small proportion to selection by it; whereas the truth is probably the reverse. Bultmann, for example, admits, in his *Jesus*, that a community-saying is not a pure invention out of the void but a construction which would not, and could not, have been made without the movement created by Jesus Himself. Indeed, the record which grows out of the community is the best testimony for the teaching of Jesus.

Nevertheless, the difficulty raised is a very real one. (1) It appears that we cannot know, with certainty, what kind of person Jesus was, since any individual story in the record of His life may not be the account of an actual occurrence but simply a symbolic representation of that which the community saw in Him. (2) We cannot say precisely what was the content of His *teaching*, since much of our record is community-interpretation rather than actual verbatim report.

To meet this perplexity we must consider afresh the nature of the evidence available. The school of Form Criticism lays emphasis on the historical method of arriving at the truth about Christianity. Therefore a very important question is, Where is *good* history to be found? Now, in answering this question, one essential class of evidence is the experience of

the early Christian Church. That possesses "communal memory." If we had the option of citing any dozen witnesses it is here that we should seek for them.

Moreover, *if* the truth is the twofold truth which Christians believe it to be, namely, that Jesus lived once on earth *and* that He is now alive and in communion with the Christian, then the *sole* direct evidence for this twofold truth is precisely the evidence of the Christian community after His death and resurrection. Neglect this evidence and you cut yourself off from the possibility of finding this truth. *Form-geschichte* can lessen the evidence available for knowing what the historical Jesus was like (showing, perhaps, that this and that were not actual incidents) but at the same time it adds to the evidence for the interpretation of the Person of Jesus by His early followers. That which is taken away from one category is transferred to the other. "Thereby losing its value," the form critic may add. But this is not necessarily so. The impression made by Jesus upon those who knew Him or were members of the early Church is exceedingly important for determining what manner of man He was. Even false anecdotes may be good history. But there is much more here, for we admit the single-mindedness of the "myth-makers"; they were *honest* witnesses. Yes, the form critic may say, honest but *mistaken*: we can prove it by showing the mistake's appearing; can film it, as it were, and demonstrate how, in all innocence, it arose. To this we can answer that the "mistaken witness" cannot have altered in any essential particular the truth about the Person of Jesus. Just as some of the miracles may not be historically authentic and yet may give essential information about the kind of person Jesus was—and without the account of these miracles we should lose something of our evidence for estimating His Person—so "mistaken witness" may be valuable, even indispensable, evidence. Again, we must remember that the *honesty* of the witnesses is not impugned.

Next, concerning the witness of today. The nature of the Person of Jesus has been more fully revealed with the passing of the centuries of the Christian Church. Wherever there has been obedience and loyalty, there has been given, inevitably, a new insight into the mind of Christ. Where the Church has been faithful, she has both learned and taught new things about her Lord. Her deeds are *His* deeds. The Gospels are still being written.

The form critic replies: "But what is discovered today about the nature



of Christ is not admissible as evidence for what He did in His lifetime on the earth." No. But His life did not end with His life on earth. The early Church may have antedated many discoveries about Him. They were made only through the fuller experience of an obedient community, but they believed—or, perhaps, *came* to believe—that these discoveries had been made in His earthly life, from deeds which He performed or words which He spoke. But with a life which does not end with any *date*, antedating is not a serious mistake. In fact, that which Form Criticism casts doubt upon is the "historic Jesus"—meaning by that the picture of Jesus as He lived between birth and death (or between birth and resurrection); but this is not all that Christians are concerned with. Christian believers today, like the Christians of the early Church, are concerned with the *eternal* Jesus. Today we believe in Him still living, still acting, still responding to prayer.

The form critic may declare that this and that is not evidence for what Jesus did or said in Galilee. Nevertheless, it may be evidence for the nature of Him who lived and spoke in Galilee. And it will still be necessary to show how this witness arose. *We* say that it came out of the fuller experience of Christ. Where *Form-geschichte* questions the evidence, we discover that it is evidence concerning that in which we are not *primarily* interested. The unique cosmical significance of Jesus cannot be proved by induction from the recorded events of His life. "That the Word has been 'made flesh,' and made flesh in just the specific Person whom a Christian calls Lord, is a proposition which admits of no establishment by the empirical appeal to certified fact" (A. E. Taylor: *Faith of a Moralist*, II, p. 126). What chiefly weighed with the earliest believers was, first, the direct impression made by their Master of the presence in Him of something "numinous," not to be understood in terms of ordinary human life, and, next, the confirmation of this impression by the transcendent events of the resurrection on the third day and the wonderful manifestations of the day of Pentecost (*ibid.*, p. 129). "One may intelligibly hold that the belief in the real continued personal activity and the supremacy of Christ, and in the reality of the contacts between the still living Christ and His disciples, out of which Christianity arose, is what is essential in the historical *credendum*, and everything else matter for criticism and speculation, not affecting the true substance of the Christian faith" (*ibid.*, p. 140).

Before considering the challenge of Form Criticism in its extreme



form, we should look for a moment at the conception of "communal memory" to which a central place must be given in the theory which we have been putting forward. Quite plainly, its importance is not confined to the period in which the Gospels were being composed. We are dependent on it in every age. Knowledge of Christ is mediated to every Christian not alone by the Gospels and Epistles but by the family to which he belongs, the society of which he is a part, the Church of which he is a member. Family, society, Church—all are handing on a tradition which runs back to the beginning of Christianity, which, moreover, has received *enrichment* in every period when faithfulness, loyalty, and obedience resulted in a more profound understanding of the mind of Christ. There is no need to postulate an infallible institution, to which tradition has been entrusted. What must be affirmed, however, is the legitimacy of trusting the "communal memory" where the community has been faithful; and this is no more than affirming faith in the Holy Spirit as guiding aright the thoughts of *good* people concerning their Master, and bringing to those who themselves had something of the mind of Christ, new understanding of His life and will. When we speak of the immediate experience of the soul with Christ today, we are not, therefore, indicating an experience which begins and ends with the individual soul, but something which is the outcome also of the Spirit's work, uninterrupted, down nineteen centuries.

Finally, we must take the extreme case. Suppose that Form Criticism should be able to apply its methods to prove that Jesus had never lived. (There are those who say that their theology is such that nothing in it would require to be changed if it should be proved tomorrow that the figure of Christ was nonhistorical. Cf. Bultmann: *Jesus*, p. 17.) Would our Christianity be the same as it had been? I am sure that it would not. It would involve a fundamental change to discover that we had, so to speak, been deceived. Having been led to faith in this highest conception of God as One who is self-impacting in this noblest of all conceivable ways, to find that God had *not* so revealed Himself in Jesus—that would be to discover that He was less in goodness and love than He might have been.

In a very real sense, the value authenticates the fact. The value is a revelation of God, but, God being also the God of historical fact, it seems to follow that the history must substantiate the revelation. "The disjunction between 'value' and 'fact' is not absolute, the supreme 'value,' God, being also the ultimate source of the whole course of historical 'fact.' . . .

What leads the spiritually-minded man to insist on the 'historicity' of a certain event really is a perception that the denial of the fact would involve surrendering a more or less adequate conception of God" (A. E. Taylor, *op. cit.*, II, p. 147).

Fortunately, it is not necessary to invoke any ontological argument to prove that Jesus lived. Drews' book on the Christ-myths, says Professor Mackintosh, is "more interesting as a symptom than as a contribution" (*Some Aspects of Christian Belief*, p. 9). It would be impossible to *prove* that Napoleon ever lived. We should readily doubt his existence if we determined to doubt the authenticity of all records and all traditions. But this would be to make history impossible; to deny continuity in experience and to fall back simply on timeless idea as the sole truth, and even on the *momentary* idea—since all ideas have a history too, and it determines their nature and their significance.

An earlier example of the claim that history could make no alteration in his faith was P. W. Schmiedel. "My most intimate religious life would not be harmed," he declared "even if today I were forced to acknowledge that Jesus never existed. . . . I would still know that I could not lose the degree of piety which I attained long ago, simply because I could no longer trace it back to Him" (quoted in *The Mediator*, p. 155, n.). Brunner considers on the contrary that everything would be lost. Christianity might still be a very brilliant idea, but it could not be a religion. That is not strictly true. There would still remain more than the *idea* of such a God as the Father sending His Son into the world: there would be the possibility, indeed the unquenchable, confident faith, that He would one day reveal Himself as we believed He had done already in Jesus. It would still be open to us to put forward this new kind of ontological argument. Descartes maintained that the idea of God, who is infinite and perfect, cannot be formed in man by any finite object, and must therefore be caused by God Himself. So, we might say, it cannot be denied that the *idea* of God Incarnate as we understand it in the Gospels was present to the minds of the first century. In the intellectual and religious *entourage* of that time there is nothing to account for the rise of such an idea. It must therefore have come from God Himself, and God cannot prove less in goodness and love than the noblest idea of God.

Happily, there is no danger of Christianity's being reduced to the form of a Messianic hope not yet fulfilled. Our religion, our creed, *would*

be different, should it be proved that Jesus never lived. But, if that should be proved, it would at the same time invalidate all history and all science.

Faith knows, for reasons which are not accessible to the historian as such, that the inquiry concerning the historical fact of Christ's appearance in the world "cannot yield a negative result" (Brunner, op. cit., p. 166). We are in possession of a line of proof which is not weakened but strengthened by the movement of form criticism. It is the testimony, not of historians, but of the histories of souls. The real presence of the Jesus of history is established by the experience of the Christian community, the Church down the ages and the Church today; by the communion of men known to us with the living Christ; and, not least for us, by that which He has said to *us* and done for us; is saying and is doing.

This is not the place to speak of the *end* of history. This mortal must put on immortality. That is the wonder of the resurrection, that the identity of the mortal with the immortal man is established in God (Barth: *Auferstehung der Toten*, p. 123). But it is the resurrection of the *dead*. It means a new beginning on another plane. Man, in time, cannot form any valid conception of eternity. Jesus left it in darkness. Nevertheless, we know that the nature of God will always be what it is shown in Jesus to be; that God's method will always and everywhere be the same, that of divine holy love.

"With this ambiguous earth  
His dealings have been told us. These abide:  
The signal to a maid, the human birth,  
The lesson, and the young Man crucified.

"But not a star of all  
The innumerable host of stars has heard  
How He administered this terrestrial ball.  
Our race have kept their Lord's entrusted Word.

.....  
"But, in the eternities,  
Doubtless we shall compare together, hear  
A million alien Gospels, in what guise  
He trod the Pleiades, the Lyre, the Bear.

"O be prepared, my soul!  
To read the inconceivable, to scan  
The million forms of God those stars unroll  
When, in our turn, we show to them a Man."

# Religion as Response

J. M. SHAW

## I

**R**ELIGION may be thought of in either of two ways. Either as an activity of the human spirit directed toward the Divine, the quest of man for God; or as an activity of the Divine Spirit directed toward the human, the quest of God for man.

At the present time, chiefly through the dominance of the psychological interest, the interest, that is to say, in the study of the human mind and its laws of working, the whole tendency is to stress the former of these two ways of thinking of religion, and to obscure or overlook altogether the latter. So much so that the very belief in the Divine, the belief in God, is apt to be represented as but a product of the human mind, "the mere projection" as it is sometimes put, of our subjective desires or human "wish-thinking."

So to represent the essence of religion, however, is to miss the deepest truth about it. Religion is certainly the search of man for God, the attempt of man in his human frailty and need to come into practical helpful fellowship with a Power or Powers above himself and greater than himself. From the dawn of human history man seems to have been engaged in this primal or elemental search or quest. But this is not the most ultimate or fundamental truth about religion. Back of man's search for God lies God's search for man. The priority, the initiative, has been on God's side, not on ours. So that primarily and fundamentally religion is not a movement of the human spirit toward the Divine, the seeking of man to come into helpful relation with God; it is the response on man's side to a prior movement on God's side. It is man's answer to God's approach. In other words, the basal and fundamental thing in religion is not human discovery but divine revelation; not man's discovery of God but God's disclosure or revelation of Himself to man.

## II

Now this is true in a measure of all religion, of religion always and everywhere—that religion on man's side, this movement of man's mind

and heart toward God, is but the response to a prior movement from God's side toward man. It is because God has first spoken to us, that we speak to God. It is a truth indeed, this, that is not confined to religion. It is true in science also, for example, and in art. The scientific interest or impulse on our side, the movement on man's side toward the discovery of truth, of law and order, in the world, is the response to God's having first spoken and revealed Himself in the presence of truth, of law and order, in the world about us. If the scientist discovers law and order in the world, it is because God has first revealed Himself in such law and order. Behind all human discovery of truth lies God's revelation of truth to be discovered. So too with the artistic interest or impulse; it is but the response on man's side to the revelation of art and beauty that God has made to man in the world without.

But it is a truth that is true above all in religion—that the initiative or priority has been on God's side, not on ours. Man seeks to come to God, because God has first come to man. "Thou wouldst not seek Me hadst thou not already found Me." Such was the word of God that Pascal heard amid his restless search. The very religious instinct or impulse, as we call this movement of the human spirit to come into touch with a higher divine power or powers, is itself God's voice to man saying, "Come unto Me." As von Hügel has expressed it: "Religion is essentially Revelation, man's deepest experience of the ultimate Reality through the action of that Reality itself." Or again, in more philosophical language: "Religion begins and proceeds and ends with the 'Given'—with existences, reality, which environ and penetrate us and which we have always anew to capture and combine, to fathom and apprehend; all this . . . as stimulated and sustained by a tenacious conviction that a real, if dim, 'confused' knowledge of reality is with us already prior to all our attempts clearly to analyze or completely to synthesize it." (*Essays and Addresses*, Vol. I. Preface.)

Religion, that is to say, as a human phenomenon implies and presupposes a prior divine revelation. Eliminate from religion indeed the idea of divine revelation or the discovery of God to man, and then you remove its whole support. "A religion that is but one-sided," it has been said, "as surely falls to the ground as a one-sided bridge." Religion would be utter illusion if man in his religious striving were but projecting himself into the void of his own imagination and desire. Religion always and everywhere implies revelation.

So it is that as a matter of history the belief in revelation is a belief common less or more to all religions. Certainly in all the great historical religions the belief in a divine revelation is found. It is a striking fact, as has been pointed out by Vernon F. Storr in *From Abraham to Christ*, pp. 27ff., that almost all the sacred books of the world profess to be based on a revelation. In India the Vedas are called "revelation" (S'ruti) as distinguished from "tradition" (Suriti). In Persia the Avesta are believed to have been communicated to Zoroaster by the god Ahura himself. Mohammedans say that the Koran is a copy of a heavenly book, the contents of which were made known to the prophet by an angel. Even in primitive religion or the religion of uncivilized people, where there are no sacred books, we find ourselves confronted with the belief in revelation. The priest, the witch-doctor, the medicine man hold their position of authority in the tribe because it is believed that they are either possessed by a spirit, or are in some way in touch with the invisible world, whose secrets they are empowered to reveal.

### III

The idea of revelation or divine self-disclosure is thus, it would seem, practically as universal as religion itself. But the higher or worthier the religion is, the more distinct or explicit becomes this belief in revelation and in God's discovery of Himself to man as the fundamental thing in religion. Accordingly, it is in the Hebrew and Christian religions that this belief in the revealing initiative of God attains to most distinctness and explicitness. Men's knowledge of God, according to the uniform Scripture representation, is the result not so much of man's discovery as of God's disclosure. As A. B. Davidson has put it, speaking of men's knowledge of God in the Old Testament dispensation: "If men know God, it is because He has made Himself known to them. This knowledge is due to what He does, not to what men themselves achieve. . . . The idea of man reaching to a knowledge or fellowship of God through his own efforts is wholly foreign to the Old Testament. God speaks, He appears; man listens and beholds. God brings Himself nigh to men; He enters into a covenant or personal relation with them; He lays commands on them. They receive Him when He approaches; they accept His will and obey His behests. Moses and the prophets are nowhere represented as thoughtful minds reflecting on the Unseen and forming conclusions regarding it, or ascending



to elevated conceptions of Godhead. The Unseen manifests itself before them and they know it." (*The Theology of the Old Testament*, p. 34.)

God reveals Himself indeed to begin with, these biblical writers recognize, in nature and the world without. It is to this revelation the Psalmist refers when he says: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge. There is no speech nor language, their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth and their words to the end of the world." (Psalm 19. 1-4.) It is a revelation, this, that is unceasing and world-wide. It uses no language that can be heard by the hearing of the ear, but it is understood by the mind of man. By this revelation, by the evidences of power, intelligence and rational order in the world, men in all ages have been convinced of the existence of a supreme Intelligence or Reason at the heart of things. The alternative explanation is that of materialism or naturalism in its various forms—that somehow things happened to fall together into harmony or order without a guiding Intelligence or Reason over all. And this is as reasonable or unreasonable as to say that by chance or accident the letters of the alphabet happened together into one of the works of Shakespeare or Browning. God reveals Himself too in history, the history of men and nations, leading to the conviction that there is over all not merely a Supreme Creative Intelligence but also a Moral and Righteous Governor, in Matthew Arnold's words "a Power not ourselves making for righteousness." That "this world is somehow built on moral foundations," says J. A. Froude, the eminent historian, "is the lesson of history. In the long run it is well with the good and ill with the wicked. This is the only teaching which history repeats with any distinctness." And then also there is the revelation of God in conscience, in the moral consciousness of man with its sense of duty or "oughtness," "stern daughter of the voice of God" as Wordsworth called it.

These are aspects of God's revelation which are general or universal, made to all men in the measure that they are able to receive them. But besides this primary more general or universal revelation, God has revealed Himself more intimately in the lives of the great religious personalities of the history of different nations. Of this the prophets of Israel were more particularly conscious. They felt that God was revealing Himself savingly in their nation's history through great historical acts and persons not for their own sakes merely but ultimately for all the world. It was a saving or

redemptive revelation which attained its end and consummation in the historical person of Jesus Christ, in His life and death and resurrection. Through the new disclosure of God as holy redeeming Father-love made in Him, the conviction was deepened that the initiative in man's salvation lay on God's side, that in His outgoing seeking redeeming love He had taken the first step in His saving approach to sinful man. "When he was yet a great way off, his father saw him and had compassion *and ran*" (Luke 15. 20). In that last phrase in Jesus' description of the Father's attitude to the returning prodigal, a recent writer has found the distinctive Christian revelation of God most vividly expressed. "Judaism hovered on the brink of saying it, but never did quite say it. It did think of God as kind, 'slow to anger and plenteous in mercy,' yet none the less it thought of the penitent as having himself to travel every step of the way which led to the Throne of Mercy. If a man could come there he would find God long-suffering and patient, but God remained on the Throne; He Himself took no step toward the sinner. The bold assertion of Jesus is that God Himself takes the initiative, and the comment of Saint John pierces to the marrow of the whole matter. 'God so loved the world that He gave.' Christian faith . . . is rooted in the conviction that the initiative always lies with God, and that before God asks anything, He gives everything (B. C. Plowright, *Everyman Prays*, p. 56). The length of this loving giving of God for man's redemption is seen in the Cross of Calvary where we see Jesus obedient to God's saving purpose through Him even to the length of death, and such a death. Through that Cross, as interpreted in the light of God's great declaratory act in the Resurrection, we know that at the heart of the universe is a Father-love that moved out to man in his unworthiness and at a cost to Himself "that passeth knowledge" redeemed him—a Love joined to Almighty Power, "able to do exceeding abundantly above what we can ask or think."

#### IV

This is what makes the gospel "good news." It was good news for men because it was good news about God. And, as Canon J. K. Mozley has emphasized in his little book entitled *The Beginnings of Christian Theology*, pp. 8ff., it was good news not in the way in which a philosophy or scientific theory might be good news, as throwing light upon the mysteries of existence through the processes of human discovery and reflection. The

stress did not fall upon that side of the matter, though indeed that side has always to be taken into account. But the stress fell on the movement from God to the world, on what God had given and done in His love. This is why the New Testament writers speak so often of the gospel as the gospel of the "grace" of God, the gospel as Paul put it of "the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us in Christ Jesus." "By grace are ye saved . . . not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." (Ephesians 2. 7f.) Our fathers used to speak of this gospel as the gospel of "the prevenient grace" of God, the gospel of our salvation as being due not to any merit or works on our side but to the gracious favor and love of God that first sought us in all our unworthiness and forgetfulness.

"'Tis from the mercy of our God  
That all our hopes begin."

"I sought the Lord, and afterward I knew  
He moved my soul to seek Him, seeking me;  
It was not I that found, O Saviour true,  
No, I was found of Thee."

Now, if such is the gospel of the grace of God, the good news of what God has done for man, what a firm basis or ground we have for a trustful and confident commitment of ourselves to His saving love and power. In the words of the hymn:

"How firm a foundation. . . .  
Is laid for our faith in His excellent word."

What more could even God have said and done than He has said and done in Jesus Christ, in His life and death and resurrection? If the initiative were on our side and the final truth about religion were that in it we are out in search for God, seeking to persuade Him to hear and receive and help us, how insecure and unfirm a foundation we would have for our faith and trust. But if our seeking of God is but a response to God's first seeking of us, and if our faith is based not on man's ideas or speculations or endeavors but on God's actions, not upon what man has thought and striven to do but upon what God has said and done, then indeed, as the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews has it, we may well come "boldly" or "confidently" (Moffatt) "in full assurance ('absolute assurance' Moffatt) of faith" "that we may obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need" (Hebrews 4. 16; 10. 22).

# The Younger Theologians

SAMUEL McC EA CAVERT

A REVIVAL of interest in theology and a new vitality in theological discussion have arrived in our midst. After a quarter-century or so during which the psychological and the sociological emphases occupied the conspicuous place in American Christianity, theology is now coming back into the center of the field. No longer is it nervous and apologetic in the presence of religious education and social ethics. On the contrary, it has a firm assurance that a religious education which is nonchalant about the historic Christian convictions soon reveals its feebleness and that an ethics which has no theological foundation is impotent to order our social relations.

Fifteen years ago there was plenty of evidence to confirm European observers in their impression that America was developing an untheological Christianity, over-pragmatic and over-activistic in its outlook. Today a change of climate is being felt. One of the barometers indicating it is the impressive number of books on theology which now issue from our publishing houses. Especially noteworthy is the fact that many of these theological volumes are coming from the younger men. The idea that theology is the concern only of an older generation which is less sensitive to modern trends is very far from the truth. Indeed, the theological renaissance is most manifest among the men of early vigor who are just now coming into a position of leadership.

One of the signal illustrations of the return to theology on the part of younger men is the existence of a group of twenty-five, modestly calling themselves "The Theological Discussion Group," drawn together by their desire for fellowship in thought. Organized about three years ago, chiefly on the initiative of Professor Henry P. Van Dusen, they meet twice a year for unhurried deliberation. Most of them are professors in theological schools or universities, but there is, however, a small minority whose work lies in the "practical" realm. With one or two exceptions, all the members are under fifty years of age. The great majority are still in their thirties or early forties.

The method followed by the group lends itself to fruitful results.

Each meeting continues for two full days. The papers are written in advance and circulated for study a fortnight prior to the session. A critic, previously appointed, precipitates the discussion promptly by focusing attention on the main points at issue. The fellowship of the group has apparently been a stimulus to theological productivity. Whether due to this influence or not, no fewer than ten important publications, in addition to articles and essays, have come from the members during their three years of association. These include: in 1934, *Realistic Theology*, by Walter M. Horton, and *Reflections on the End of an Era*, by Reinhold Niebuhr; in 1935, *Social Salvation*, by John C. Bennett; *God in These Times*, by Henry P. Van Dusen; *God and the Common Life*, by Robert L. Calhoun; *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics*, by Reinhold Niebuhr, and *The Church Against the World*, by H. Richard Niebuhr, Wilhelm Pauck and Francis P. Miller; in 1936, *Present Theological Tendencies*, by Edwin E. Aubrey; *The Resources of Religion*, by Georgia Harkness, and *Contemporary English Theology*, by Walter M. Horton.

The group does not represent any particular school of thought, either theological or philosophical. Its members are as far apart as Wilhelm Pauck and Edwin E. Aubrey, or as John Mackay and Gregory Vlastos. All would, however, call themselves Christian theists, in contrast with the humanists. Certain general trends, too, are characteristic, in varying measure, of the group as a whole, and it is with these that the present article is chiefly concerned.

The writings of this particular group are, of course, only one of many indications of the theological energy of the younger generation of thinkers. Any adequate list of the other volumes of arresting theological significance which during the same years have come from men who may all be described as "younger" must surely include such contributions as *A Christian Manifesto*, by Edwin Lewis; *Personality and Religion*, by Edgar S. Brightman; *Frontiers of Christian Thinking*, by Frederick C. Grant, and *Christianity in America*, by E. G. Homrighausen.

Among the trends which are reflected to a greater or less degree in most of these younger men five may be mentioned as of major import. These trends are certainly not to be found equally in all of the thinkers whom we have mentioned, and perhaps some of the new emphases are uncongenial to a few of the men, but, viewed in the large, they may be taken as symptomatic of a large body of incisive theological thinking today.

## THE REACTION AGAINST LIBERALISM

The first clearly marked trend is *a reaction against modern liberalism*. Most of the influential younger theologians of today have come out of a liberal background, but they are acutely conscious of its shortcomings. Some of them hardly escape falling into the mistake which children easily make of being so critical of their own parents as not to recognize their real virtues!

One of the most frequent criticisms of liberal religion is that it has been too optimistic about human nature. The lofty estimate of man and the confidence in human progress, "onward and upward forever," which were presuppositions of the liberal mind in the pre-war and pre-depression days, have suffered a terrific jolt. Such optimism is now felt to have rested upon a shallow understanding of life. Even though there may be "moral man" within a limited range of interests, still there is "immoral society." At least after the appearance of Reinhold Niebuhr's book (1932) in which these two concepts were set over against each other in a brilliant paradox, it was not easy to go on building castles-in-the-air for humanity. The natural impulses to egoism, greed and even brutality in men in their social relations were now seen to be more deep-rooted in their nature and more tragic in their consequences than had been suspected by those trained in the evolutionary tradition. The depths of human sin stood out more starkly than the liberals had realized. The adequacy of our human resources for salvation (however defined) could no longer be lightly taken for granted. The naturalistic humanism, to which the extremes of liberalism had opened the way, now met its sturdiest resistance from those who had once prided themselves on being in the liberal succession.

The recoil of the younger theologians from the optimism of the liberals included a dissipation of the rosy hopes for bringing in the kingdom of God by a steady process of social evolution. Disillusioned by the tragedy of the World War and by the economic anarchy that followed it, they now lost their old-time assurance about building Jerusalem in England's (or America's) pleasant land. Combined with the shock of the war and its aftermath went the challenge of Marxist thought as a powerful influence making for a more realistic study of our social and economic life than had characterized the liberal outlook.

The weightiest protest against liberal religion expressed itself in a



pronounced dissent from the tendency to identify Christianity with contemporary culture. Liberalism, according to the criticism of the younger theologians, has been so openminded, so hospitable to the prevailing temper of the times, so given to compromise, that it has made a tolerant and fatal adjustment to the character of secular civilization. In so doing it has surrendered its own distinctive witness and has lost its power to cope with the moral crisis. A right-about-face on the part of the Church has been called for, a summons which has been vigorously voiced in a recent sermon, "Beyond Modernism," by the best known preacher of the modernist heritage, Harry Emerson Fosdick. "In the new enterprise," he says to his fellow Christians, "the watchword will be not, Accommodate yourself to the prevailing culture! but, Stand out from it and challenge it."

The protest against the enmeshment of Christianity in the secular outlook has been vividly illustrated by a manifesto bearing the suggestive title, *The Church Against the World*, by a trio of younger theologians, H. Richard Niebuhr, Wilhelm Pauck, and Francis P. Miller. They announce their stand against any Christianity which takes its color from the cultural environment—a Christianity which accepts the presuppositions of the current nationalism and thereby loses its supra-national genius, a Christianity which enters into an unconscious alliance with capitalism when capitalistic economics are regnant, or which with equal facility may make itself entirely at home in a communistic society of tomorrow. The kingdom of God, these young theologians insist, always far transcends any economic or social pattern that man can devise and it is the business of the Church, at all costs, to bear uncompromising witness to its own divine truth. The Barthian influence is unmistakable, although doubtless none of the three collaborators would call himself a Barthian. Like all who come under the Barthian spell, they give an exposition which is much stronger in its negative aspect than in the positive, and state their views in a more extreme form than is congenial to some of their associates.

In spite of their dissatisfaction with liberalism, it would be a mistake to assume that many of the younger American theologians have ceased to be liberals. Even those who would not care to describe themselves as such have not divorced themselves from cardinal elements of the liberal heritage. At least the great majority of them still cherish its open-eyed appreciation of the contribution of science, its free pursuit of the truth, its assertion of the importance of the insight of the individual, its interest in the his-

toric Jesus and its emphasis on the continuity of the Christian revelation with reason. They do not want to go so far in their reaction against liberalism as to lose its permanent values. As John C. Bennett wisely says: "Since we know that it is the habit of pendulums to swing, it should be possible to keep our minds from following through all the way each time."

It needs to be remembered, too, that the present protest is not so much against liberalism itself as against certain of its assumptions, and even more against its mood. For liberalism is not a set of conclusions as much as it is a method. The method of historical analysis and of trying to make Christianity intelligible to a generation whose intellectual outlook is very different from that of the generations that gave creedal expression to the great Christian convictions, we cannot abandon, however rightly we criticize, certain of the attitudes of the liberals.

#### A REALISTIC THEOLOGY

A second trend among the younger theologians is *toward a more "realistic" theology*. Anyone who listens to Reinhold Niebuhr, for example, cannot fail to note how fond he is of insisting that we be realists. *Realistic Theology* serves as the title of one of Walter M. Horton's best known volumes. The point of view which the word expresses has deeply affected the thinking of many others. The most consistent and systematic exponent of "religious realism" in America is Paul Tillich, whose loss to Germany has been a pronounced asset to the theological resources of the country of his adoption.

What the younger theologians chiefly mean by calling themselves realists is that they do not share the subjectivist tendency which entered strongly into the liberal tradition through Schleiermacher's emphasis on religious experience, Ritschl's reliance on value-judgments and Kant's assumption that what our moral nature regards as necessary may be "postulated" as true. At the center of attention the realists place, not the religious subject, with his experiences and judgments, but the religious object. What is at stake in Christianity, they insist, is not the worth of our experiences but the existence of the reality that we think of as associated with them. What they are concerned about is the objective structure of things—a structure to which man must conform, whether or not it satisfies his own desires and interests and values. God is not to be equated with the

highest reaches of human aspiration and imagination. He is no projection of man's ideals or of his social consciousness. He is objective Reality. He is not merely immanent in human life but transcendent, reaching into the world from beyond man and taking the initiative in a relationship to which man can never attain by his own powers.

This reorientation of the younger theologians' conception of God fits in with what they feel to be their realistic understanding of man. They are determined to face the hard and unpleasant facts as well as the pleasant. They no longer accept the old optimism about human nature; they are conscious, as the liberals generally were not, of the "tension" between human sin and divine grace. In fact, one wonders whether certain of the realists are not in danger of becoming unrealistic pessimists, failing to recognize even the measure of good which, in spite of all our disillusionments, is still to be found in man.

The deflated estimate of human nature carries with it a loss of confidence in the possibility of achieving anything like the Christian social goal through democratic processes and the natural response of man to the "sweet reasonableness" of Christian ideals. Only radical measures, the realists say, can deal with the deep-rooted disease of our civilization. At the same time they find in historic Christianity something which modern Christianity has lost—a profound insight into our human predicament. As a result, some of the realistically minded (like Reinhold Niebuhr and Walter Horton) speak of themselves as "moving politically to the left and theologically to the right."

The interpretation of God in terms of judgment—a theme of which Henry P. Van Dusen makes much—fits in with the realistic approach. We have readily believed, he says, in "a God of cosmic order and power and a God of love, but not a God of social righteousness, the God of history." We must learn that "God's influence upon society is most easily discerned as judgment and discipline." There is, in other words, an inexorable process in reality itself which makes our selfishness and injustice bring about our undoing. An economic system which denies a fair share of the product of industry to the masses ends in collapse. An international system which relies on violence proves to be self-destructive. God's judgment is redemptive in its ultimate purpose, but this must not lead us to overlook the evidence of history that divine love does not exempt mankind from penalty for personal sin or social evil.

## REVIVED INTEREST IN REVELATION

A third trend is *toward a new concern with revelation*. The interest in revelation, as Walter Horton has discerningly indicated in an unpublished paper written for the Theological Discussion Group, does not arise in any acute form so long as men feel self-complacent and harmoniously adapted to their world. In such a mood they preach a "gospel of self-reliance" and see no limits to the powers of the human mind. But that is the very antithesis of the present outlook. Our former intellectual self-assurance has deserted us. In our confused and baffled state, when our faith in our own wisdom wanes, the interest in superhuman wisdom and help revives. It then becomes "a primary concern of contemporary theology to reassert the full Christian idea of revelation, while at the same time making it plain that faith in revelation does not violate that reverence for all truth which liberal Protestantism has—let us hope—made permanently a part of the Christian conscience."

The clearer recognition of the limitations of science for giving us a "saving knowledge" of the meaning of human existence adds to the present concern with revelation. The scientist, as we now see, gains his enviable precision in his own field by a process of abstraction which deals only with those aspects of reality that his particular method can handle. Thus science never gives us more than a partial account of reality. And the aspects which it ignores—the values, the meanings and the ultimate nature of life as a whole—are the very ones on which we most desperately need light for the business of living.

Now if God is not merely immanent in the process of life but is the transcendent reality on whom we depend, then the concept of divine revelation is not the outmoded dogma which many moderns assume, but stands for something central in Christianity. Religion, then, is not primarily man's quest for God but God's self-revelation to man.

The recent emphasis on the "emergent" aspect of evolution has decided relevance in connection with the doctrine of revelation held by many of the younger theologians. As developed in Lloyd Morgan's Gifford Lectures, evolution is not to be understood as a purely continuous process; there is a principle of "discontinuity" as well. Whereas the older evolution blurred all the distinctions between God and nature, man and the animals, Christ and man, emergent evolution takes cognizance of new origins

and therefore of real differences. This opens the way for the recognition of unique "emergents"—for example, man and the Divine-man Christ. Robert L. Calhoun, in *God and the Common Life*, is one of those who builds strongly on the principle of emergent evolution in laying the rational groundwork for faith in a God who as Cosmic Mind is actively functioning in the world and bringing new creations to pass.

The conception of revelation which thus emerges is a way of asserting God's initiative and God's purposeful activity. As Henry P. Van Dusen has pointed out, there is "a long mile of difference" between the idea (popularly held) that God *is revealed*—in the phenomena of nature, for example, or in the moral consciousness—and the idea that God deliberately *reveals Himself*. The first conceives revelation as both vague and passive; the second, as active, and leaves room for "special" as well as "general" revelation.

Revelation is general as it comes to us through the processes of nature and of history, specific as it comes to us through Jesus Christ. And it is the special revelation in Christ which gives us the clue to general revelation, showing us what to look for as significant disclosures of the divine purpose, correcting our otherwise inadequate understanding of it, and enabling us to discern what would otherwise be obscure. This is not to say that because we have revelation we can dispense with reason; for revelation, too, has its own kind of limitation. As summarized by Walter Horton, "science is exact in matters of detail but extremely unbalanced in its total perspective; revelation is fundamentally right in its total perspective but quite inexact in matters of detail." What revelation gives us is light on the ultimate meaning and destiny of life.

The new place of revelation in present-day theology has brought back into current usage a term that for many had lost its meaning—the supernatural. In fact, several of the theologians of whom we have been speaking are now sometimes referred to as neo-supernaturalists. In using the word supernatural, they are repudiating a conception of reality from which spiritual meaning and value have been artificially eliminated and are affirming a God who is not shut up in a closed system or a mechanically fixed sequence of cause and effect, but is active as a living Person. They are directing attention to the fact that we are in contact with reality not only through our sense-experience, which relates us to what we ordinarily call "nature," but also through our appreciation of values which, for purposes

of distinction, we may describe as "supernature." They are also asserting that there is a realm in which we have a direct awareness of and personal communion with God. It is these higher levels of reality, from which the scientific method is shut off by reason of its limitations, which the term supernatural, as used by the new supernaturalists, signifies. The supernatural is no longer set over against the natural as a contradiction of it (as in the case of the older supernaturalists), but rather pervades nature as its ultimate meaning and completion.

The concept of the supernatural, of course, belongs only to those who have a clear conviction of God as transcendent, who see Him not only as operating in the physical system but as over and above it. Henry Nelson Wieman, for example, is to be thought of as in contrast with all the neo-supernaturalists. Wieman is essentially a prophet of God's immanence. When God is conceived as a "process of interaction" or as "a structure of existence and possibility" or as "growth of meaning and value in the world," there is no place for such a concept as the supernatural; the term naturalistic covers everything in his philosophy and religious knowledge is confined to that which can be reached by the scientific method.

#### RETHINKING THE "SOCIAL GOSPEL"

A fourth trend involves a *rethinking of the "social gospel."* The younger theologians are so definitely the heirs of the social interpretation of Christianity as made current by Walter Rauschenbusch that they are in no danger of divorcing our thought of God from our social consciousness or of thinking of salvation in individualistic or purely "inward" terms. They are well aware that the "individual" *per se* is a mere abstraction, and that the development of self-consciousness takes place through "a bi-polar process in which the Ego and the Social Other are simultaneously differentiated." They have no patience with a religion that ignores the social environment; they know well enough that, although no change in social conditions can of itself produce spiritual health, nevertheless social conditions can and do mean needless spiritual loss to millions of men. Yet with all their social vision and social passion the younger theologians are undergoing a noteworthy change in their attitude toward the so-called social gospel and are frankly critical of some of its former assumptions.

For one thing, they no longer share in the fair hopes that the kingdom of God is to be achieved by easy evolutionary stages. "Romanticism,"



"utopianism," "naiveté"—express the impatience of many with the older outlook. They see no prospect of our society's becoming anything comparable to the kingdom of God. They are appalled by the mad orgy of racialism and nationalism, the rise of Fascism and the imminent threat of class conflict and war. The influences which on the Continent of Europe prepared the way for Barthianism are now being strongly felt in our own country and, while there is small likelihood that its extreme views will be accepted here, the Barthian criticism of the social gospel is not without its effect.

Certainly a new sense of tension between Christianity and all social orders, all economic systems, all political structures, is being felt. Reinhold Niebuhr flatly denies the possibility of a society fully controlled by Christian love and contends that justice—or rather an approximation of it—is the most that we can expect. Gregory Vlastos, however, takes his friend Niebuhr to task for this view, holding that love, as set forth in the New Testament, is not the pure disinterestedness that Niebuhr assumes. The essence of love, according to Vlastos, is not complete identification with others but "a maximum of mutuality" and of co-operative endeavor. Niebuhr's description of the love-ethic as "perfectionism" is regarded as both a mistaken reading of the Gospels and a failure to distinguish between love as an emotion and love as an ethical attitude.

While the difference between Niebuhr and Vlastos at this point warns us against facile generalizations about the views which are common to the younger theologians, they are pretty much at one in their desire to prevent Christianity from being further entangled with contemporary civilization. They see it as a fatal mistake in the "social gospel" of the last forty years that it tended to reduce the kingdom of God to the level of human culture. Christianity, it is stoutly asserted, has been too ready to adapt itself to secular society. The younger theologians insist that every social order—capitalistic, nationalistic or socialistic—will always be sub-Christian. Sin as the corrupter of every social system has come to be recognized as a fact that must be reckoned with, more than the social gospel has yet reckoned with it.

H. Richard Niebuhr is a spokesman for the more Barthian view of the relation of Christianity to society in his protest against what he calls "a strategy of self-salvation by works." It was the tendency of the earlier social gospel, he says in a recent issue of *RELIGION IN LIFE*, "to speak of

social salvation as something which men could accomplish for themselves if only they adopted the right social ideal, found adequate motivation for achieving it and accepted the correct technical means." While not at all proposing to abandon the effort to devise the best possible programs of social action, Richard Niebuhr would caution us against our former expectation of achieving the Christian social goal by legislation or any form of external reorganization. Much of the social gospel, he would doubtless say, has been no *Gospel* at all, but only a program of social reform. To urge men to "get busy and build a new world" is not Good News; there is Good News only when men learn that there is God who wills a new world and who has more than human resources for bringing His purpose to pass.

#### THE NEW PLACE OF THE CHURCH

A fifth clear-cut trend among the younger theologians is in the direction of *a much greater emphasis upon the Church than has been characteristic of Protestantism*. They do not think of Christianity as an individual possession requiring little or no corporate expression, but as a life in a society. For them the Church is central because fellowship is of the very essence of the Christian religion. With Walter Horton they react decisively against the prevailing "low" view of the Church as merely a "collection of religious individuals, each carrying on his private and peculiar type of commerce with God, but occasionally gathering for worship in the same place, where they may listen to some exceptionally gifted preacher air his private religious opinions—after which they go their separate ways as before." For the younger theologians the Church is something more than the sum of its members; it is a great movement of organic life in which alone the individual can find the true home of his soul.

The dominance of a nationalism which splits humanity into fragments and the emergence of a totalitarian State which makes itself the supreme object of loyalty have been an intense stimulus to the "higher" conception of the Church. Over against the pseudo-collectivisms of state and race and class thoughtful Christians set the true collectivism—the universal fellowship of those of every land who are bound together by their loyalty to the purpose of God for the world as revealed in Jesus Christ. It is here, and only here, that the younger theologians discern the hope of that human solidarity which Josiah Royce happily called "The Great Community."

The present lack of such a conception of the Church Universal and the present failure of the existing churches to embody such an ideal they regard as the greatest weakness of Protestantism.

The younger theologians who take this view of the Church differ from many of their fellow Protestants in finding much common ground with contemporary Catholicism. One of the members of the Theological Discussion Group, Daniel A. McGregor, himself a moderate Anglo-Catholic in the Protestant Episcopal Church, has developed a rather novel approach to the doctrine of the Church in a pamphlet entitled "The Sacred Humanity." Taking his point of departure from the general conception of emergent evolution, he regards the Church as a "new emergent"—not in a figurative but in a literal sense. Just as man was a new creation in the evolutionary process, just as Christ was the creation of a new type of man, so the Church is a new creation of God. It marks a new level of organic social unity achieved by Jesus and His disciples and has set for all time a new pattern of social relationships. Whether one feels that there is weight in this particular argument or not, it is one expression of the enhanced regard for the Church which is coming to be widely shared.

Another way of stating the ideal of many thoughtful men of the younger generation would be to say that they yearn for "a Catholic Protestantism" or, perhaps, an "Evangelical Catholicism." They are eager to identify themselves with the whole stream of life that has come down through the Church, a stream of life that first took form in the prophets of Israel, burst upon the world in full power through Jesus Christ, and continues its power in the historic movement that flows from His life. Nothing less than such a corporate and catholic Christianity is regarded as an adequate expression of religion in the modern world.

## Further Thoughts on Form Criticism

FREDERICK C. GRANT

THE question is sometimes asked whether or not the history and literature of early Christianity belong within the field of Oriental studies; and if so, to what extent this is true. Geographically considered, there is no doubt that the history and literature of primitive Christianity belong to the history and literature of the Near East; but to say the least, it was a Near East which was undergoing a vast transformation under the pressure of a quite external political and economic westernization. Moreover, the area involved in the earliest origins of Christianity lies upon the very periphery of the Orient rather than anywhere near its heart. Our question would have required a very different answer if, let us say, Christianity had arisen in the Tigris-Euphrates Valley or upon the plateau of Iran—to go no further east. Furthermore, the almost complete departmentalization of theological and historical studies, as pursued in most theological seminaries, has resulted in an isolation of the New Testament and of the movement which lay behind it from their rightful place in Oriental life and literature. It may be that Orientalists have acquiesced in this isolation, since to include primitive Christianity within the scope of Near Eastern history and literature would be certain to lead one to occupy some position or other involving religious controversy. As a rule, therefore, early Christianity has been treated as a movement apart from the world in which it arose; and all too often Near Eastern history has been studied, as far as possible, without reference to that movement in which all its long religious history, at least down to Roman times, finally culminated.

It is true there have been exceptions to this general practice. Ernest Renan, for example, was a scholar who combined deep interest in the origins of Christianity with wide learning in the field of Oriental studies. A much more recent figure was that of the late Eduard Meyer, the great historian of antiquity, whose *Origins and Beginnings of Christianity* may be looked upon as a kind of second *magnum opus*, in addition to his *History of Antiquity*. The late F. C. Burkitt of Cambridge and the late Julius Wellhausen of Berlin, are other examples of scholars who brought to the study of primitive Christianity a wide knowledge of Oriental subjects—not to

mention living scholars, American or foreign. Too often the student of primitive Christianity brings with him only a knowledge of the Greek half of the Eastern Hellenistic world; admirable and indispensable as this is, it is not enough. New Testament studies certainly stand to gain by a wider knowledge of the life, thought and religion of the Near East on the part of its students. Similarly, it might not be amiss if more Orientalists tried to include primitive Christianity within their range of studies rather than exclude it on the ground that it was largely Greek, or that the primitive Church moved over almost at once into the Occident.

## I

The latest movement in New Testament criticism emphasizes the importance of this Oriental background and promises to end the isolation of the New Testament from its Near Eastern background. This movement, known as Form Criticism, is a study of the oral tradition lying back of the Gospels and their sources; it at once takes us back to the soil of Palestine and to the thought-world of an ancient people, who, in the first century, were still far from being completely Hellenized. Form Criticism may be dated from 1919, when Martin Dibelius published his *Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (second edition translated, *From Tradition to Gospel*, 1935). Two years later Rudolf Bultmann's *Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition*<sup>1</sup> appeared, and one or two other works. The leaders of the school are still Professors Dibelius and Bultmann, though several other authors must be reckoned as members of the group. An English writer of the same persuasion is Professor Vincent Taylor, whose *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* was published in 1933.

As Mackinnon and others have pointed out, the principles underlying the method of this school are not wholly new. Some of the results of Form Criticism were anticipated, more or less, by the work of such scholars as Julius Wellhausen and Johannes Weiss. The initial suggestion in fact came from the field of Old Testament study, mainly from the work of the late Hermann Gunkel, whose studies of the legends in Genesis and early historical books of the Old Testament had led him to a careful consideration of form. A great advantage enjoyed by the student of any oral literature covering as long a period as that of the Old Testament is that he

<sup>1</sup> Not translated. A briefer work of his, *Jesus*, has appeared in English, and also his *Study of the Synoptic Gospels*, in the volume entitled *Form Criticism: A New Method of New Testament Research*, translated by the present writer.

can trace in some measure the modifications in form of at least some of those creations. The literature of the Old Testament covers a period roughly of a thousand years, the literature of the New Testament barely a century, that of the Gospels hardly more than two generations. It is not likely, therefore, that the development will cover as wide a range in the New Testament as in the Old; though what is lost in extent is somewhat compensated by intensity, and there is also an advantage in tracing the development on a larger scale as a result of a closer view and a relatively larger number of documents. The gamut traversed, say, by the development lying between Q and L and the Gospel of John—or even the Gospel of Matthew—is as great as any in the Old Testament, though the process took barely six or seven decades at most. However, the method is still in its infancy and it is to be hoped that if once more New Testament studies can be allied with Oriental studies generally, more light and guidance will be forthcoming from the Oriental side. It is to be presumed that the laws governing the formation of oral tradition in Palestine, say, between the years 30 and 50 or 60 A. D. were the same laws that operated in ancient Babylon, in ancient Egypt, in ancient Arabia and in ancient Iran, and everywhere else in the ancient world.

Not only is the method known as Form Criticism not entirely new, but it is a method which is after all only one more application of what must still be known as the one historical method—a point upon which Hans Lietzmann has insisted in the recent first volume of his *History of the Ancient Church*. Form Criticism is surely not destined to supplant historical criticism or literary criticism. It is only one more particularization and application of historical method. Its peculiarity lies in the fact that it deals exclusively with the oral tradition lying behind the evangelic documents. It tries to reach back into that dim period, not by ignoring the documentary study of the Gospels, but rather by taking such study completely for granted and then pressing on from the known to the unknown. It is an effort to bridge the gap between the life of Jesus and the earliest documents embedded in our Gospels; an attempt to study the development of this tradition in the same manner as the study of tradition in any other period or part of the world. As such the method should be an indispensable tool in the study of the origins of the Christian religion.

The *first step* in Form Criticism is to recognize what Gunkel called the *Sitz in Leben* of the tradition, and to see how it is related to the social



or religious environment out of which it grew or which maintained and handed it down. This stage of research is closely related to what Professor Case and others denominate the social-historical method. In other words, it insists that no tradition gets handed down unless it meets a real need on the part of those who cherish and preserve it. Books do not get re-printed or re-copied unless there is a demand for them. The same holds true of oral traditions; they do not get re-told and handed down over a series of years or of generations unless they meet a real need, literary, social, religious, recreational, or whatever it may be.

The *second step* is to classify the material and to find the appropriate setting in the community for the various types or main divisions of classification; and then for the specific material set forth under these types. The main classifications in the gospel tradition are obviously "Parables," "Sayings," "Pronouncement Stories," "Controversies," "Miracles," "Legends," "Passion Narrative." Each one of these types met a need or a group of needs in the early Church. The decisions contained in the Pronouncement Stories were valid decisions controlling the life and conduct of Jesus' followers long after His death. His Sayings were cherished not only because of their literary beauty, and not merely out of personal devotion to the author, but because they set forth guiding rules for the community. The stories of Jesus' controversies with the scribes and Pharisees provided arguments for those of His disciples who were still engaged in such controversies. The Miracle Stories provided evidence of His divine or superhuman or Messianic nature; perhaps they also contained suggestions of technique for Christian exorcists and healers. The Legends met the need for detailed information of an imaginative nature upon details of Jesus' life and work, regarding which the older tradition had been silent—the circumstances of His birth, infancy and youth, His adventures in the pagan territory beyond the Lake of Galilee, the "popular" narrative of the martyrdom of John—and so on, features in the life of Jesus which not only point in the direction but lead us a long way toward the artificial embellishment of the gospel tradition in the so-called apocryphal Gospels of the second century and later. The Passion Narrative, perhaps the oldest element in the gospel tradition, obviously met a twofold need, both liturgical and apologetic. It provided the setting in story form for the Lord's Supper, which was the distinctive Christian rite of worship from the very beginning, and it also provided answers to the otherwise staggering ques-

tions which might be asked by enemies or outsiders, namely, "Why did Jesus die?" "How did it come to pass that His own nation refused to accept Him?" "How could a person as gentle and as good, and as supreme a teacher as Jesus was, end His life on a cross between two bandits?" These are some of the needs which the tradition met and which serve to account for the preservation and handing down of the narratives and sayings which meet us in the Synoptic Gospels. No doubt there were other elements in the life of Jesus and other traditions—as the late author of the fourth Gospel indicates (20. 30, cf., 21. 25)—which never got written down, which in fact were not handed down orally for very long and which consequently have been forever lost to history.

Martin Dibelius insists that it is to the early Christian *preaching* that we owe the preservation of the gospel tradition. Each one of these types or classifications is related to the preaching of the gospel in the earliest Christian communities, but perhaps it would not be far wrong to widen this principle a little and recognize the work of the early Church teachers, as well as the preachers of the gospel. In fact, as he conceives it, preaching does include teaching. This was the material, in other words, which the earliest Church handed down about Jesus of Nazareth. Most of it was modified in the process of tradition, some of it much more than the rest. There is nothing surprising about this. Oral tradition is always modified in the process of handing down. It is far too human to be otherwise.

Correct classification is the first step to be taken in any science. Such classification ought to proceed regardless of any theory of what it may prove; there is simply no telling what you may find after the correct classifications have been set up. The theories of Darwin and Wallace were based upon the patient and accurate system of classifications worked out by Linnaeus and others who preceded them.

The *third step* is to look for laws governing the development of oral tradition. Some of these laws are already apparent, as for example:

(1) As a rule stories of healing miracles are told in three stages, the patient's condition, the description of the cause of his ailment, next the cure, finally the result—so conclusively is this a "law" that it is hard to see how such a story could be told in any other way.

(2) As tradition goes on, more and more proper names are added and unnamed characters are provided with names—preferably familiar names. Thus sometimes unrelated anecdotes get drawn into the cycle of stories relating to some hero. "A certain disciple" becomes James or John or one of the others who were

already well-known. Sometimes purely fictitious names were provided—as for example, the three wise men who appear in the apocryphal Gospels, as Gaspar, Melchior and Balthazar, but who have had no names assigned them in the canonical Gospels.

(3) There is an added emphasis upon the noble attributes of the hero and an attempt is made to neutralize or omit things which caused uncertainty or even gave pain to his followers. We can trace this process much later, not only in the history of the New Testament text, and also in the process of editing the Gospels, where Jesus' "wrath" is omitted and where the weakness or stupidity of the apostles is silently overlooked. If such a process can be traced in the development of the text as the work of scribes in the second, third, fourth and later centuries, and if it can be traced in the editing of Marcan material as it appears in Luke and Matthew, it is certainly a process which really took place in the period of the oral tradition, antedating the gospel documents.

(4) In general there is an increase in circumstantial detail. This is inevitable and is involved in the storyteller's art. Stories do not grow less detailed as they pass from person to person, but rather grow more detailed.

(5) There is also a tendency to introduce additional speakers in dialogue. This takes place sometimes even to the extent of doubling or further multiplying persons already named. This "law" we also see at work in the Synoptic Gospels. One blind beggar in Mark becomes two in Matthew—who even makes the one ass, which Christ rode at the triumphal entry, into two animals, perhaps out of deference to a literal interpretation of Old Testament prophecy. If such a "law" was operative in the revision of material from a Gospel, how much more was it likely to operate in the process of handing down the tradition upon which the gospel was based!

(6) In general likewise there is an enlargement of the auditory. A handful of people becomes a multitude and a crowd of listeners becomes a great concourse, sometimes to the extent of quite impossible figures.

(7) Parallel or kindred stories floating orally in the general milieu are now and then gathered into the traditional mass. One does not need to go back to the Gospels for illustrations of this. The stories told of Abraham Lincoln provide many illustrations, as undoubtedly do those of Napoleon and other great figures in history, notably Mohammed's "Table Talk," which Lane Poole drastically reduced in extent and still admitted that it undoubtedly contained much extraneous material. An illustration of this sort of story in the Gospels may be the parable of Lazarus and Dives which perhaps, as Bultmann thinks, goes back to an Egyptian original. What the story was destined to become in Christian circles may be seen not only from the fourth Gospel but also from the Egyptian Clement of Alexandria. Perhaps another illustration is the Nativity narrative in Saint Luke, which has undoubtedly incorporated earlier Jewish material and even hymns.

(8) There is also a tendency in the direction of the removal of theological obstacles and limitations, and on the other hand a greater emphasis upon the miraculous wherever the miraculous may be thought to be involved.

These are just illustrations, and no doubt other "laws" will appear

as time goes on and we become more and more familiar with the process by which oral tradition gets handed down—not only in ancient Palestine but the world over. It is quite clear that even in those neighborhoods where by long custom and from the earliest times the memories of men have taken the place of pen and parchment, tradition is no static energy, no force engaged only in the passive task of conservation. Tradition is what the early Christian writer Papias called it, “a living and abiding voice.” As living it shares the proper character of life, which is to develop, to transform, to undergo modification, to adapt itself to new needs and situations.

And yet the conservative, centripetal force exercised by tradition is naturally much stronger than the centrifugal or adaptive. This is what distinguishes a historical tradition from a purely literary. The traditions of the founders of the world’s religions and of other great personages in the past have not undergone one tenth the modification which is to be seen, let us say, in the purely literary legend of Faust.

In the case of the early Christian tradition there were special circumstances accounting for this fact. As Maurice Goguel remarks in his recent *Life of Jesus*, “The bearers of the [evangelic] tradition were men completely incapable of any interest, of any curiosity which might be described as historical or biographical; their whole habit of mind, their mental outlook, the orientation of their interests left them indifferent to the idea of historical exactitude and unable to judge in questions where it was involved; facts held no interest for them as facts, but only as the revelation of a transcendent reality; accordingly it should not surprise us if tradition has elaborated to some extent the materials entrusted to it. On the contrary, the surprising thing is that they have not undergone a much more profound transformation, and that in place of the evangelic history there has not been substituted some myth giving a more homogeneous, more direct, more completely unified account and explanation of the Christian faith.”<sup>2</sup>

## II

But is Form Criticism a criterion of the historicity of tradition? Mackinnon and others reply in the negative, and indeed, it would appear that the test of the social-historical setting cuts two ways: (1) The tradition did not contain anything which did not meet some need in the early

<sup>2</sup>M. Goguel, *La Vie de Jésus*, p. 160.

Church; (2) at the same time any saying or trait retained in the tradition which ran counter to apostolic doctrine or practice must be allowed the *prima facie* presumption in its favor—it must have been true and authentic in order to be retained in spite of the tendency of the apostolic age. The second of these principles underlies the logic of Schmiedel's famous "Pillar" passages, which he set forth as material which could not possibly have been invented in the apostolic age. It also underlies the argument of William Sanday in his *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, namely, that the gospel tradition must be reliable since it contains so few traces of apostolic influence. The principle therefore is one which has been used in Christian apologetics for some time. The other principle, namely, that whatever tradition retains must have met some need in the early Church, is of more recent application. However, the two principles do not really exclude each other. Both are true within limits, and the historian must exercise a fine balance of judgment in applying both. As a general rule the tradition met certain specific needs, but it is not possible to identify every one of these needs, and it may not be possible to connect every specific saying or even legend (to take that type of tradition which would be the first to be involved at this point) with the need which it met. Nor is it fair to infer that needs always, or often, or ever, *produced* tradition; rather they kept alive traditions which were already in existence. And yet on the other hand, when a tradition runs clearly counter to a tendency observable in the apostolic age it deserves most careful consideration—for example, the reference in Saint Luke to Joseph as the "father" of Jesus, or the statement in the Gospel of Mark that Jesus "could do no mighty work" in Nazareth because of his fellow-townsmen's unbelief.

In a way the method known as Form Criticism is a further extension of the analysis of sources in the Gospels, though the analysis of sources is really only a preliminary to Form Criticism, which goes on beyond this to the preceding stage and analyzes the oral tradition, so far as it is recoverable, upon which the documents are based. It is not enough to remove the editorial "frames" which have been supplied by the authors or compilers of the Gospels; nor does it suffice to eliminate passages or phrases or single words which have either obviously or probably been added to the tradition. As Goguel says (p. 187) it must not only be proved that the material has not actually been produced by the tradition—but that it *could* not be produced by the tradition. And he gives examples of material which could not

be produced: Matthew 10. 5b, Mark 14. 62, Luke 17. 24f. (passages which unfortunately most Form critics will be inclined to question).

"Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans:" this seems to come from that document or cycle of tradition which Streeter labels M and which at this point has against it not only the general tenor of the Gospels but specifically representation in L.

"Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven": this verse is viewed by Dibelius, Lietzmann, and others as a later insertion into the Passion Narrative, as is the whole contradictory and more or less improbable section dealing with the Jewish trial.

"For as the lightning, when it lighteneth out of the one part under the heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall the Son of man be in his day. But first must he suffer many things and be rejected of this generation." Goguel insists that since there is no question here of death or of resurrection (contrast the three Marcan Passion Announcements!) the passage is totally inexplicable if viewed as a creation of the Christian tradition. On the other hand, it is by no means certain that every Christian review of the life of Jesus must have laid emphasis upon His death and resurrection; moreover, the tendency to heighten the apocalyptic element is so apparent not only in Matthew, but also, though in less degree, in Mark (and Luke) and even in Q, that some scholars have concluded that this element in the Gospels is no mere "heightening" but an actual intrusion into the earliest tradition of Jesus' life and teaching.

Goguel quite properly admits that the cases where such a test as he has proposed is applicable are quite limited. There are sayings of Jesus which do not meet any such test, and which are nevertheless certainly authentic. Nor can the principle be reversed, and any saying of Jesus be pronounced unauthentic which is in harmony with the Christian conceptions of the apostolic age! These sayings of Jesus bear their own witness and are self-authenticated and in turn serve as a touchstone for testing others found in close connection or in the same context with them, or whose meaning is harmonious or parallel. As Goguel remarks (p. 189), "The sayings recognized as authentic become centers of crystallization about which are organized the other solid elements of the tradition."

There are one or two other questions which arise in this connection and confront not merely the Christian apologist but every historian who



deals with this period. Having verified the curve, so to speak, traversed by the tradition, but projecting it backwards from the definite points of reference within the Synoptic Gospels, are we permitted to carry the line to a point where it approximates zero? For example, from the fact that the miraculous is steadily heightened as the tradition grows, are we entitled to infer that at the beginning no miraculous element at all was contained in the evangelic tradition? To this our answer must be a round negative; it is quite contrary to historical probability. The fact that miracles were elaborated and even multiplied in the tradition is no argument to prove that originally it contained none at all. The fact that the tradition attempted to "spare the Twelve" and to erase those traits which appeared unfavorable to the Church's founders, by no means proves that originally they were men entirely lacking in intelligence and character, possessing no understanding for Jesus' real purpose and ideas and without any genuine attachment to Him. "The causes which determined certain developments of the evangelic tradition were not those which determined its genesis" (Goguel, p. 163). The creation and the modification of the tradition are two entirely different things. Moreover, traditions are not created by groups but by individuals; groups merely hand them on, and either drop or preserve them along with their modifications. Hence it is not to be expected that traditions are to be explained as the projection of community interests; even in the case of legends, where such a process ought to be first observable, if at all, the community invariably makes use of existing materials. Myth is a very different category; but so far as we can see, there are no examples of myth in the Synoptic Gospels, nor even in the fourth Gospel. The only possible exception is the story of the Temptation; but the spirit of that story tells against its interpretation as nothing more than an idea arrayed in the guise of a historical incident.

### III

The question will be asked, "What becomes of the life of Jesus after Form Criticism has done its work?" Before answering this question it might be well to point out that even apart from Form Criticism, the documentary or Source Criticism of the past generation has completely altered the situation from what it was, let us say, at the end of the nineteenth century. Not only must the fourth Gospel be left more or less at one side, but the Marcan Hypothesis has likewise had to be shelved. The old-fash-

ioned full-length life of Jesus became more and more impossible as scholars recognized ever more clearly that the Synoptic Gospels, Mark quite as much as Matthew and Luke, represent the "editorial" interweaving of earlier materials which were for the most part already in writing. Hence it is not Form Criticism alone but even the earlier Source Criticism, which everyone now in some measure accepts, which has rendered impossible the old-fashioned life of Jesus. A life of Jesus based upon present-day historical research can be little more than a sketch.

However, this need not surprise us. Compared with the available material for the life of any other Jew of the period, indeed for the life of any Jew of the ancient world (apart from the military exploits of the Maccabees, or the autobiographical efforts of Josephus) the material for the life of Jesus is relatively super-abundant. Even in the case of Hillel or of Akiba, the saintly patriot of the Second Revolt, one has great difficulty in making out what might be called his "career"—a few anecdotes and sayings, the story of his martyrdom with his last utterance like a jewel set in gold—these are about all.

Accepting the conditions under which we must work, and viewing the Christian tradition as not differing much in form from either the Jewish tradition of the time or from the popular Greek accounts of philosophers and teachers, we find that the material at our disposal does really enable us to make out fairly accurately the range and the quality of Jesus' teaching—what Renan called His "sublime ideas"—the main outline of His life and more or less the conditions under which He worked. But we are still far from a final answer to some of the major questions in the life of Jesus. For example, why did He go to Jerusalem when He must have known that His life was unsafe in that stronghold of His enemies?<sup>3</sup> Such a journey was as hazardous as it would be for some heretic or reformer to enter Mecca, or visit the Tomb of Ali on the eastern border of the Arabian desert. Jerusalem was the "holy city" of a fanatical religion and it was in the hands of an autocratic and conservative priesthood, jealous of their powers. The older theological answer, that He went there to die and to lay down His life as a sacrifice for the sin of the world, is not entirely clear, to say the least, from the earliest tradition; and on the other hand there are indications—not yet fully made out—of an attempt of some kind, not merely to convert the city, but to capture it in the name of God and to purge it of

<sup>3</sup> M. Goguel, pp. 380-383.

abuses—a purely religious and in no sense a political move, as we should judge from the general tenor of Jesus' teachings. Just how far Jesus Himself took the leadership in this movement is another question having no certain answer as yet. But at the very least, the movement which led Jesus to Jerusalem must be viewed in terms of Oriental religion and not of Occidental politics or social reform.

Another question is the extent to which, if at all, Jesus claimed Messiahship. The origin of Christianity as a Messianic sect argues very strongly the existence of a "Messianic-consciousness" on the part of Jesus; but it does not prove it. Dean Case, for example, writes the life of Jesus and consistently maintains that Jesus had no wish or thought of being Himself the Messiah. Nevertheless the Messianic element in the Gospels is indisputable; though Form Criticism, like Source Criticism, removes many of the apocalyptic touches in the tradition and may even question the whole of this factor, it is impossible to read it entirely out of the sayings of Jesus or out of the background and ethos of His time. The appearance of John the Baptist with which, as both Mark and the book of Acts insisted, the gospel "began," and the anecdotes which fill the pages of Josephus, speak all too plainly. However, a Messianic ethos is quite another thing from an actual claim to be Messiah. We are not able in the light of Form Criticism to accept any such view as that of Albert Schweitzer, for whom "thoroughgoing eschatology" is the cardinal principle of interpretation. Form Criticism has not yet run its course, by a long way; and it is too soon to announce the final result of the application of this method in the study of the gospel tradition, but it certainly seems clear that the figure which emerges before us as a result of this new method is one far more Jewish, far more Oriental, far more in harmony with His own times and as such, far more natural, though at the same time a unique and in the last analysis an unknown figure—but certainly one whose powers are not to be attributed to any effort to approximate the methods or the manners of the Hellenic sage, the Graeco-Roman thaumaturge or mysteriosophist, philosophic evangelist or mystic. He is a prophet, a Jew, a Semite, an Oriental in his every utterance and gesture, as he moves before us in the tradition. He is an Oriental prophet—and much more than a prophet—but he is certainly first of all an Oriental prophet. Let us hope that the joint research of Orientalists and of New Testament critics may succeed in bringing into clearer focus for our times the outline of His majestic, divine figure.

# The Preacher an Interpreter

A. STEWART WOODBURN

## I

**T**HE preacher is an interpreter. At least he ought to be. To put it that way is perhaps an admission that every preacher is not.

The fact is there are current two rather diverse ideas of the preaching task. The one is that the preacher is a sort of ecclesiastical or theological middle-man whose task is to pass on to his people truths which he gets from some great repository. The other is that which is set forth in this presentation, that he is the interpreter and re-interpreter of a living gospel in terms of the philosophy of life that is current today. The former rests on a view of truth as a fixed and timeless deposit and of the preacher's part as directing people to its source. The latter is based on a view of truth as more like a vivifying, refreshing stream, than a bank deposit, and of the preacher's task as that of inviting folks to drink and live. The first is a view of God's revelation as perfect and complete, and of man's part as an implicit acceptance of that revelation. The second is a view of God's work as never done. He is never tired of giving fresh revelations of Himself. The best and fullest is in Jesus, and we delight to turn to Him. He helps us to see God in many places. From the one point of view the Church is the channel of this perfect revelation and the means wherethrough the grace of God is made available to needy men. From the other standpoint the Church is regarded as the organization of like-minded and like-motivated people whose lives have been quickened by the grace of God into service. The preacher who holds to the former point of view regards his own message as a call to men to accept the "faith once for all delivered unto the saints." He who holds to the latter thinks of his message as a call to harness life with its problems and tasks to a living, growing faith—a faith that seeks to express itself in building the city of God here and now.

It is a poor, bloodless view of our faith to regard it as a stationary affair. Yet that is one of the temptations against which Christianity again and again has had to struggle. As long as folks regard religion as an affair of life, they will appreciate Jesus' declaration that His mission was to help men to a life more abundant. I have been reading a book by the Hindu

philosopher, Sir S. Radhakrishnan, *East and West in Religion*, in which the author lets us see how Christianity looks to a deeply religious non-Christian. He finds a wide gulf between the religion of Jesus and western Christianity. In the west the tendency has run, he thinks, to an over-rationalization with efforts at definition and regimentation. The results have included elements of scholasticism and dogmatism which are irritating to the Oriental mind. And Jesus was an Oriental.

We have become so much absorbed with the faith about Jesus that we have lost sight of the virility and vitality of the faith of Jesus. It is of the quintessence of faith that it is personal. To declare adherence to the faith is not merely a subscription to theological formulas. We sing,

"Faith of our fathers, living still,  
We will be true to thee till death."

Now, a faith that is "living still" is not just a faith that we have inherited from somebody else. We do no honor to our fathers if we accept their faith as we would some ready-to-serve cereal. Being true to the faith of our fathers means having a living faith that still makes bold to venture into new paths. Venturesomeness is one of the great aspects of faith. We are confronted with a great battery of problems, interracial, international, economic, political, social, and so forth, for which there are no ready-to-apply solutions. There is abundant room for Christian faith to make adventures in seeking a solution to these problems in the spirit of brotherly love.

But there is also the area of thought into which ventures may be made. The world has always been ready to pay homage to great souls like Florence Nightingale, Jane Addams, Oliver Cromwell, Abraham Lincoln, Wilfred Grenfell, and Albert Schweitzer, who made great adventures in human service. But it has been almost equally ready to apply the Inquisition to anyone who made adventures in the realm of interpretation. Let a man suggest a new interpretation of the life and teachings of Jesus, of Christian experience, or of God, and someone is ready to question his orthodoxy. What effrontery to God Himself to set ourselves up as having all the truth! We ought to have the courage to let men make mistakes if we can climb over their efforts to higher things.

In our colleges and universities today young people are being trained in the scientific outlook. They are taught to employ it in philosophy. They are urged to use it in human relations. When they come into our churches,

do they find an interpretation of religious life that harmonizes with that outlook, or is it one that ignores the scientific approach? Happily for them, there is a growing body of men in the pulpits who are endeavoring to show the possibilities for an enriching Christian experience in a science-dominated world. But every now and again one hears of a preacher in trouble because he has tried to do that. A story that came to me from a recent State Convention was of a layman who rebuked his minister for this type of preaching. The layman had a son in college, and the minister asked him whether his son was helped by that kind of preaching, to which the layman replied in the affirmative. "Then," said the preacher, "if I have to choose between you and your son, I am going for him." The Church of tomorrow, if there is to be one worthy of the name, will be made up of these young people, many of whom are so bewildered today. You and I are building for the future when we try so to interpret our faith that we win the youth of our communities to the reasonableness of the gospel.

## II

Interpretation is the task of making a meaning plain for those to whom it might otherwise be obscure. In religion that is a far more difficult and a far more extensive thing than offering a rational explanation. The finest interpreters of religion have been those who were often the least concerned with definitions or syllogisms. They have been the men and women whose everlasting concern has been to embody the meaning of faith in living relations. What else counts? What people do speaks far more eloquently than any of their oratorical flights. That is the reason that some ministers who are poor tools in the pulpit are nevertheless great preachers. Their lives preach sermons to which people never tire of giving their attention. They are living sermons, fresh incarnations of the spirit of God. And they preach in a language that all can understand. It is said of Adoniram Judson that he burned with the desire to preach the gospel before he had learned Burmese. One day he walked up to a Burman and embraced him. The man went home and reported that he had seen an angel. Men called Judson "Mr. Glory Face." His life was an inescapable sermon.

Let us not forget that other people are like ourselves. They would rather be doing something than having something done for them. It is no true interpretation of religion to try the spoon-feeding plan with our people. We are poor interpreters of the Christian faith when we fail to bring



to people a challenge that will inspire them with the desire to serve. I do not mean by that a multiplication of offices and officers for the sake of appearing to give people something to do. You and I have met with people in churches who are exceedingly busy doing a great many things that do not matter. They are busybodies, busy about sweet nothings. Such living gives an altogether misleading interpretation of the meaning of Christianity. It is a heresy of the worst sort. But where is there a community that does not offer a thousand channels for significant service? The trouble in most of our local churches is that we are far too self-contained. The family living next door to the church may be in the direst straits, but if they do not belong to us, we pass up the opportunity. Wherever there are people in need, there is the call of God to us to let them realize what Jesus meant when He spoke of giving a cup of cold water in the name of a disciple.

Does it ever occur to you that some people who are outside the organized Church are setting forth by their lives more significant interpretations of Christianity than hosts of others who are inside? Whoever is enraged by oppression, injustice, and selfishness, and whose heart burns over unnecessary suffering and ill-gotten profit, whoever suffers shame when he sees another do something mean, whoever repents when his city or his country fails to rise to a moral challenge, be he inside the Church or out of it, is finding the meaning of the Christian spirit. Why not hail him as a brother in the faith, and seek to co-operate with him? The minister who is the truest interpreter of the gospel is one who understands that interpretation is a shared task, and who inspires his people with the desire to co-operate with him in it.

We are being reminded by a good many people today that religion is a way of living. Such an interpretation rings true to the spirit of Him who said "I am the way." Religion is not just a compartment of life, a once-a-week affair, if you will. It does not represent a set of ideas and activities to be employed only on occasions marked in red letters on the calendar. The religion of Jesus is the impartation of a spirit and an attitude that suffuse all of life and enrich it both for the Christian man and for those whom his life touches. If we are to bring the Christian spirit of brotherly love to play in all human relations, we shall want to live in harmony with all that is ennobling and enriching around us. We shall have no quarrel with scientists or artists, journalists or statesmen who are also concerned with the enrichment of life. May I suggest that in interpreting the Christian gospel

to our generation we shall find some of the best available instruments forged in the laboratories of science and in the great political experiments of democracy? Perhaps we shall want to use some that have been forged in our industrial life. Co-operative industry ought surely to be able to help us devise some instruments that will help. Building the city of God is always best done with the finest instruments that have been devised. In appealing to the intelligentsia of our day, we may with the utmost heartiness invite them to bring all their cultural gifts to the co-operative task of discovering the meaning of Christian living in our world.

### III

Let us turn back to the problems of interpreting the gospel in the sermon. Every sermon is an interpretation of the Christian gospel. It may be an atrocious one—or it may be a stimulating one. Whatever its quality, it is going to be regarded by some of the audience at least as a commentary on the Christian life and its significance. That fact places a great responsibility on the preacher. There are times, no doubt, when pastoral duties crowd the time for the preparation of the sermon to a minimum. At such times we would give a good deal if people would not take our interpretations too seriously. But they will. The fact is that the very time when you are busy and have made your preparation scanty may be the time when some of your listeners are passing through crises and need your best. You and I who preach have a sacred duty to the gospel, to the Master we serve, to our parishioners and to ourselves to submit to as few hindrances as possible in our preparation of the message. Who knows when someone will get an impoverished conception of the Christian faith through our neglect? On the other hand, there is always the chance that you may plant an enriching thought in the mind of someone which will bear fruit out of all proportion in significance to the germ from which it began. For that reason every man who stands in the pulpit needs to think through as carefully and intelligibly as lies within his power, the great questions of a Christian theology. You can only approach an adequate interpretation as you have loved the Lord your God with all your mind.

People expect their minister to be an interpreter of history from the Christian standpoint. The Christian faith has entered into a great heritage in the Hebrew philosophy of history which is reflected in some of the great passages of Old Testament literature. The great prophets gave evidence of

their religious insight in the way they were able to use the history of the Hebrews and of their neighbors as evidences of the work of God. To them history bore testimony to "one increasing purpose," the purpose of a holy and yet merciful God. May we not say that it was through their philosophy of history that they arrived at the lofty conception of ethical monotheism? A time of crisis is always a golden opportunity for the man with a great religious message. Many of the greatest periods of creative religious thought have been critical periods in the social or national life. At such times the sense of need and dependence is most poignant. People are in a receptive mood for any message that will help them to understand what is difficult and perplexing.

The Christian interpreter today needs to be a man of many parts, for all sorts of people are looking to him for a gospel. Recently a gentleman told me of a conversation with a biologist, a man whose life is immersed in that science, and who sees all the problems of life and religion through the eyes of a biologist. He said to my friend: "I would gladly go to church if even occasionally the minister would preach a sermon on religion from the biological point of view." Why couldn't his minister do that? Think of the possibilities in such a text as "I am come that they might have life, and have it abundantly."

The minds of a great many people have been thrown into confusion today by scientific education. The old view that man is a special creation, the *terminus ad quem* of God's creative work, is poles removed from such a view as we have in Sir James Jeans' book, *The Mysterious Universe*. There is a tremendous challenge to the Christian interpreter to help perturbed minds regain a sense of perspective.

These are the great words of Blaise Pascal who lived two centuries ago: "Man is but a reed, the most feeble thing in nature, but he is a thinking reed. The entire universe need not arm itself to crush him. A vapor, a drop of water suffices to kill him. But, if the universe were to crush him, man would still be more noble than that which killed him, because he knows that he dies and the advantage the universe has over him; the universe knows nothing of this."<sup>1</sup>

There are still possibilities for rising above the purely mathematical or metrical view of the universe to an appreciation of its spiritual resources. We have not exhausted reality when we bring to it our measuring rods and

<sup>1</sup> W. F. Trotter, *Pascal's Pensées* (Translated), p. 347.

statistical formulas. After all, we ourselves are parts of the universe, bone of its bone and flesh of its flesh. Whatever of goodness or beauty or happiness we are able to discover or create is within this same universe which on its other side is describable in terms of physical laws. The physical sciences may give us the laws of motion, of gravitation, and of thermo-dynamics. But the man of Christian faith finds in it also evidences of a spiritual power with which he can ally himself. Biological science can give us an account of the descent of man from lower forms of life. By faith he is able to realize what he is worth as a son of God. The social sciences describe for us the forward and backward pulls of group forces. Christian faith assures us of our kinship with the highest and best. The world still needs an interpretation in terms of the highest adventures of Christian faith.

There is a great deal more in human experience than can be explained or understood. Some of the facts that we have to face are mysterious. We cannot comprehend them, and yet repeatedly we have to face them. There never has been a time and probably never will be when people who are baffled by the mysteries of suffering and death will not look to the Christian minister to bring them some message regarding the meaning of such experiences.

I can only pass on one or two suggestions as to methods of interpreting these experiences of mystery. Take suffering. Why in the economy of the universe it was necessary, we do not know. But we know that as human nature is constituted, if we were robbed of the ability to suffer, we would likewise lose the capacity for enjoyment. Our feeling experiences are bipolar. Remove either, and you have a colorless neutrality. Most of our experiences are admixtures of pain and pleasure. The important matter is the spirit in which suffering is endured. It is only a great faith that enables the suffering soul to exclaim: "Though he slay me, yet will I trust him." It may be difficult to comprehend any meaning in a particular painful experience. Often the meaning and worth of an experience have to be wrested from it by courageous faith. Let me remind you of those great words of George Eliot in the Epilogue to *Romola*:

"It is only a poor sort of happiness that could ever come by caring very much about our own narrow pleasures. We can only have the highest happiness, such as goes along with being a great man, by having wide thoughts, and much feeling for the rest of the world as well as ourselves; and this sort of happiness often brings so much pain with it that we can only tell it from pain by its being what we would

choose before everything else, because our souls see it is good. There are so many things wrong and difficult in the world that no man can be great—he can hardly keep himself from wickedness—unless he gives up thinking much about pleasures or rewards, and gets strength to endure what is hard and painful. . . . If you mean to act nobly and seek to know the best things God has put within reach of men, you must learn to fix your mind on that end, and not on what will happen to you because of it. And remember, if you were to choose something lower, and make it the rule of your life to seek your own pleasure and escape from what is disagreeable, calamity might come just the same; and it would be falling on a base mind, which is the one form of sorrow that has no balm in it."

Another mystery equally difficult of interpretation, and yet bringing experiences of poignant need for a sustaining faith is death. John Baillie, in his recent book, *And the Life Everlasting*, has given a refreshing approach to this old problem. Many young people today are fond of remarking somewhat nonchalantly that they do not care what becomes of them after death, and are not interested in the beyond. That may be all well enough for us to say in regard to ourselves. But it would be somewhat less than human to take such an attitude in regard to our own loved ones.

Most people have a feeling of dread in regard to death. This feeling is due to a number of causes. One is the love of life. Another is ignorance of what lies beyond. Still another is the fragmentary character of our knowledge of what death is. Would it help in some cases to point out to people that death is all along a part of life? The life processes involve a combination of katabolism and anabolism, of disintegration and reintegration, of tearing down cells and building up new ones. The elimination of dead, waste material is absolutely essential to life and health. Every day we die to live. Should it after all be considered an unwarranted venture of faith to believe that when the bodily functions cease we may die to live more abundantly than ever?

The civilization of which we are participants is presenting a perfect flood of problems for thoughtful Christian people. Economic rivalries of all sorts and proportions are motivated by greed, the lure of profits and the will to power. International relations are characterized by competition and strain. Interracial contacts breed superiority and inferiority complexes. Who has a word for such a time? What are we doing to raise the morale of our civilization by messages of power? This is a great day for the preacher who has the boldness to carry his Christian idealism into the heart of the world's woes.

## Recent Palestinian Archaeology

C. C. McCOWN

THE task of the archaeologist is not an easy one. The glamour that throws a golden mist over Luxor and Jerash and Palmyra quickly wears off in the midst of dust and sweat and potsherds. And even the open air, sunshine, and human contacts of the long, hard days on the "dig" are absent when he settles down with his potsherds and his record cards to write an account which must be interesting to please his supporters and scientific to muzzle his critics. But the task of the layman who tries to follow and understand the reports is even more trying. The archaeologist is dealing, not with mathematical problems, each of which can find only one definite, correct answer, but with indeterminate equations, often with problems that have three or four unknown quantities. His answers frequently depend upon a "personal equation." Differences of conclusion from the same data in the archaeological field are notorious. But frank discussion of moot points is the life of any science.

The great progress that has been made in Palestinian archaeology since the war has been in no small part due to co-operation and interchange of ideas between excavators. The fact that three schools, the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem, the British School of Egyptian Archaeology, and the American School of Oriental Research are meeting under the roof of the American School, where they are sharing both libraries and ideas, argues well for future progress. The new museum in Jerusalem, with its commodious quarters, its well stocked library, and its varied and competent staff, who are interested, not merely in the Hittites or the Hyksos or the Philistines, but in all periods of Palestinian history, from its geological beginnings to modern times, is another factor that will soon place Palestine far ahead of any other country, not as a source of museum specimens, but as a center of scientific archaeological and historical study. For there are few countries in the world which so completely recapitulate the history of civilization as the land from which three of the greatest religions of the world arose.

The last year has seen three personal losses which will affect the future of Palestinian excavation. Professor James Henry Breasted died



in New York in November, just as he was returning from an inspection of the numerous expeditions of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago in the Near East. It is reported that there will now be a severe curtailment of the field work of that important institution and that the Megiddo expedition is to be closed. Professor William Frederick Badè, Director of the Palestine Institute of Pacific School of Religion, died in March, after three months' illness, induced partly, no doubt, by his strenuous campaign the previous spring at Tell en-Nasbeh. This summer Mme. Krause Marquet, excavator of et-Tell (Ai), passed away in Paris, after an illness that was certainly aggravated by her labors the previous autumn. The excavation of Tell en-Nasbeh was complete, and provision is being made for the publication of the results. Doubtless the same will be done for et-Tell, where, however, more excavation is needed. Father Mallon, the keen-eyed discoverer of Teleilat el-Ghassul, passed away a year ago this spring, but his work is being carried on. There are other sites which, for the moment, are lying fallow: Tell Beit Mirsim, Beit Sur, Tell el-Ful, Bethel, Seilun, Balata, Samaria, Beisan, Saffurieh, Jerash, Petra, where much remains to be done. Innumerable sites have not yet been touched, and there is no want of archaeological opportunities in Palestine.

Archaeological activity in recent years has been prodigious. Last year, from July 1, 1935, to June, 1936, at least twenty-one excavations, large and small, were carried on, and some chance finds of importance have been made. The number was approximately the same in the years immediately preceding. Only a few of the most significant expeditions and discoveries of the last three or four years can be mentioned.

To understand the history of Palestine, one must begin with its geology and paleontology. A chance find in a garden at Bethlehem promises to develop into an excavation of first-rate importance. Miss Gardner and Miss Bate during a few weeks last spring and this made a most auspicious beginning, which was described to me individually by Miss Bate, and by Miss Gardner in a lecture which I had the good fortune to hear in the Wellcome Research Laboratory in London, where some of the finds were on exhibition. Large pieces of elephant tusk and bones of other animals point to a warm interglacial period as the time when the bone-bearing gravels were laid down by floods of water. Deposits of chalk-like *nari* limestone above the gravels prove that the period must have been early. If the geo-

logical and paleontological results eventually determine the time, they will also serve to date the great rift in which the Jordan flows, for the deposits are now on top of the watershed between the Mediterranean and the Dead Sea. The excavation is only in its beginnings, and much is known to be lying, awaiting another season's work, in the great pit that has been begun.

The excavations of the series of prehistoric caves in Wadi el-Mughareh, the "valley of the cave," at the western foot of Mount Carmel, are now at an end and the results will be published in the not-distant future. The preliminary publications show that Mr. T. D. McCown's cemetery in Mugharet es-Sukhul, with its nine burials, some of the skeletons as complete as any that have ever been found, and the skeleton in Mugharet et-Tabun which Miss Garrod, director of the expedition, found, together make an unrivaled contribution to our knowledge of Neanderthal man, while the various levels of occupation which Miss Garrod found in the three caves, fit together into an unparalleled series, which runs from the Acheulean to the Mesolithic period. Meantime, M. R. Neuville has uncovered at Jebel el-Qafse, the "Mount of Precipitation," near Nazareth, five skulls which he believes to be Acheulean in date and, therefore, much older than the Neanderthal remains of Galilee and Carmel. The preparation of the extremely fragile remains for publication may take five or ten years, and meantime their exact value is undetermined, but in any case it will be considerable. Into the picture of prehistoric Palestine there is to be fitted also Miss Garrod's discoveries at Shuqbah and its happily named Natufian civilization, and M. Neuville's finds in Wadi Khreitun.

After the Natufian civilization of Shuqbah and Mugharet el-Wad, there is a break in the series until one comes to the lowest level at Jericho. Professor Garstang's excavations there have had the unexpected result of discovering the earliest known city civilizations of Palestine, a most remarkable series of superimposed levels, clearly marked and unmistakably separated by a succession of polished and painted floors. They begin before pottery was known and run on through its earliest beginnings in unbaked vessels of clay. The series of levels, with rectangular buildings, then round houses, then rectangular again, with sanctuaries, astonishing figures of painted clay in human form, a wonderful series of flint artifacts, pottery, figurines, and many smaller objects, all coming from ages hitherto unknown, render this one of the most fruitful expeditions in Palestine.

The site carries the history of Palestinian civilization through a real

Neolithic, the Chalcolithic, and the Bronze ages down to the fall of the city in the Late Bronze period. It should be noted that Tomb A, once called the Two-Brothers Tomb, from two young Americans who first cleared a large part of it, has proved to belong, not to the Middle Bronze, but the Early Bronze period, perhaps 2200 or 2300 B. C. Further excavation made this year in an as yet untouched section of the mound above the spring, convinces Professor Garstang that his dating of the fall of the city before the invading Israelites at about 1400 B. C. is correct.

Into this long process of cultural evolution, running from the Acheulean period to the coming of the Israelites into Palestine, with only the one noticeable lacuna at the end of the Mesolithic and the beginning of the Neolithic, future discoveries will have to be fitted. Miss Joan Crowfoot, who handled the flints for Professor Garstang, found that she could fit into their places the various culture types which Miss Garrod, M. Neuville, and others had distinguished. There can now be no doubt that the unexpected discoveries made at Teleilat el-Ghassul by Father Mallon and his colleagues belong in the Chalcolithic period and that these remarkable cities near the head of the Dead Sea have nothing whatever to do with the "cities of the plain" of the story of Sodom and Gomorrah, for they are 1,500 or 2,000 years earlier than Abraham. To this Fathers Lobignac and Koeppl, who are continuing the dig, are completely agreed. The scientific interest of the work is not thereby diminished. The pottery, the flint instruments, and the stone mortars, some of them crude, some of them fine, the astonishing paintings on mud walls, the burials, all serve to complete and enlarge the picture which Jericho paints on a somewhat smaller canvas, because there a lesser area of the corresponding levels has been excavated. The excavations at Teleilat el-Ghassul this spring have served to check over the results of previous campaigns and determine the pottery sequences more precisely in the upper levels. They are to be continued until the whole series of levels is thoroughly understood.

If Teleilat el-Ghassul fills in the picture of civilization in Palestine beginning at about 3500 B. C., or a little earlier, et-Tell, where Mme. Krause Marquet was at work, takes up the tale a little later and carries it down to near 2000 B. C. The great size of the area occupied by this Early Bronze Age city was one feature which astonished the visitor. Another was the puzzling maze of city and house walls which crossed and paralleled one another. The center of interest was the three superimposed sanctuaries

which successive ages had built against the city wall, with a rude stone altar still standing and before it the skull of the last calf which had been sacrificed. A little higher up, on the top of the hill, were the foundations of a "palace" facing eastward upon a courtyard. The pottery which Mme. Marquet had collected from tombs and from the mound made a pretty show in her exhibition. These results, especially with further excavation, will wrest from et-Tell a fascinating story of civilization in the hill country before 2000 B. C. Yet all of this gives little idea of the historical value of the dig. The astonishing and unexpected feature is the fact that no Middle or Late Bronze Age remains were found. That means that et-Tell was not occupied when the Israelites conquered Palestine, for everyone agrees that they must have come in before the end of the Late Bronze Age. A few years ago, in his book on *Joshua-Judges*, Professor Garstang showed how admirably the Biblical account of the capture of Ai by the Israelites fits the geographical situation of et-Tell. Having gone over the ground with him, I can only testify that the topography of the story must come from some one who knew the lay of the land thoroughly. But if et-Tell is Ai, which seems almost indubitable, then the whole story is a fabrication. Either another site with equally suitable topography and with the proper archaeological remains must be found, or one may suppose that the capture of Bethel was transferred to Ai, or that the tradition of the destruction of Ai, which took place before 2000 B. C., was handed down to the Israelites, who, later, patriotically took it for granted that only their national hero, Joshua, could have reduced so mighty a city to the "ruin" (that is the meaning of both Ai and et-Tell) which they saw.

The subject is worth another remark because of its significance for archaeological method. Professor Albright, from surface remains, and Professor Garstang, from pottery which he uncovered in trenching about the walls of the citadel on top of the hill, had concluded that the city was certainly occupied in the Late Bronze Age and destroyed at the time of the Israelite invasion. Later excavations elsewhere revealed that the types of pottery on which they based their conclusions persisted into the Iron Age. They came from the Israelites themselves and proved nothing as to Late Bronze occupation. That is to say, archaeological conclusions must continually be revised in the light of new information. But another point needs to be made: archaeology, which at first seemed beautifully to confirm the Bible, has now turned against it. It cannot be repeated too often

that the business of the archaeologist is, not to prove the Bible true, but to discover the historical truth, whether it fits the Bible accounts or not. It is as silly to suppose the Bible inerrant in history as in science. It embodies historical sources, but its chief values lie in other fields.

The story of civilization in Palestine in the Middle and Late Bronze Ages has been partially told by a number of expeditions which have been reported previously in *RELIGION IN LIFE*, or are otherwise well known. The work of Sir Flinders Petrie's British School of Egyptian Archaeology at Tell Jemmeh (Gerar), Tell el-Far'a (which is not Beth-Pelet), and Tell el-'Ajjul has thrown much light on the relations of Palestine to Egypt, upon the Hyksos (without as yet solving their problem), and upon other immigrants and invaders. Now at Sheikh Zuweyid, just over the border in Egyptian territory, he has begun on another mound which promises to add further details to the picture. Illness prevented Miss Margaret Murray from continuing the excavation of Tell el-'Ajjul. Unfortunately, Sir Flinders' "long chronology" makes it difficult for others to use his results, especially since he depends largely on his own long and unique experience as an excavator and makes little use of the results of others.

Another expedition which has made extremely important discoveries covering the whole of the Bronze Age and the beginnings of the Iron Age, is that of the University of Pennsylvania Museum at Beisan. This, unfortunately, is temporarily in abeyance. The last digging there has gone into the early levels, below the remarkable series of Egyptian temples on the south side of the mound. The Beisan excavations have served especially to emphasize the fact that Egyptian influence in Palestine during the second millennium B. C. was much more extensive than the Biblical sources had suggested. This fact, which is fully confirmed by other excavations and historical sources, has not been sufficiently recognized by Old Testament scholars.

Among all of the expeditions in Palestine, one of the most immediately fruitful and of the most promise for the future is the Wellcome Archaeological Research Expedition under Mr. J. L. Starkey at Tell ed-Duweir, or Lachish. The mound is enormous, and its bases as well as the surrounding hills are full of tombs of all periods. Great walls from various ages, of stone and of adobe bricks, a glacis of stone, another of terre pisée, an acropolis, and a succession of gates testify to repeated forti-

fication. On the top a Persian palace and a sanctuary of that period have been found. Near the base a sanctuary of the Late Bronze Age has already revealed three successive phases and various utensils, some with cryptic inscriptions. Tombs have yielded a wealth of pottery and other small objects. Hundreds of skulls, from mass burials after some great disaster in the Israelite period, should throw long-desired light on the racial constitution of the population. Most sensational of all has been the recovery of inscribed potsherds dating probably from the time of the Babylonian invasion of 588-86 B. C., found in the guardhouse just outside the gate. One of them establishes the identification of the site (instead of Tell el-Hesi) with Lachish. These potsherds give welcome contemporary evidence as to political and religious conditions at this crucial period in Hebrew history.

The third big expedition in Palestine—along with Beisan and Tell ed-Duweir—and the most elaborate of all, is that of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago at Megiddo. It covers much the same periods as Tell ed-Duweir, but was less important after the Exile. For the last six or seven years the center of popular interest has been the stables of Solomon and the large building and gate of that period. Removal of the stone pavement before the gate has proved that the pavement belonged to a slightly later period. Now an extremely strong and hard lime pavement of the eleventh century is exposed. This year excavation to the west of the gate has revealed a great building of the Late Bronze Age, either a palace with a small chapel, or a temple, for an altar and other cult objects were found in one room. Soundings on the south side of the mound have disclosed an area of poor private houses. A large sounding under part of the stable area on the south east has laid bare a series of temple constructions, the oldest of which, built about 1500 B. C., was either unfinished or destroyed at the time of the capture of the city by Thutmose III in 1479 B. C. It showed Babylonian relationships in its plan and appointments and seems to have been sacred to the North Syrian god, Resheph, small bronze images of whom were found in and near the cella. Egyptian influence was indicated by fragments of statuettes in diorite and basalt, some of them as early as the twelfth dynasty, that is 2000 B. C. Burials made within the city, one of them with fine gold jewelry, appear to date from the time of the siege by Thutmose III. Thus, just after Doctor Breasted's death and when the expedition is threatened with sudden extinction, the period in



which he had a long-continued and never-failing interest begins to come to light.

Tell en-Nasbeh is a much smaller site than those just mentioned and its depth of deposit very much less. However, it lay in a strategic position with regard to the little territory of Judah, and the strength of its walls and magnificent gate, one of the finest and best preserved yet discovered in Palestine, prove its importance in the period of the monarchy. Tombs under the mound and in the hills around it indicate occupation throughout nearly all periods of Palestinian history down to Byzantine times. The seal of Jaazaniah, one of the officers of Gedaliah, which was found in a tomb, connects the city directly with the exilic period. Along with other evidence, numerous sealings bearing letters which seem to read M-Z-P have convinced Doctor Badè and many other scholars that the site can be no other than the Mizpah of Samuel. The last campaign, in the spring of this year, has added much confirmatory evidence. Doctor Badè's careful methods and orderly records will make the writing up of the results by others comparatively easy, although his penetration, breadth of information, and interpretative skill will be sadly missed. The site has the distinction of being the only one in Palestine which has been completely excavated.

The majority of the ancient sites of Palestine present the excavator with materials from widely separated periods, sometimes with a long succession. That is true of three excavations which Dr. W. F. Albright has carried on under the auspices of the American School of Oriental Research, although their chief interest has been pre-exilic. A second campaign at Tell el-Ful, or Gibeah of Saul, has disclosed the fact that the castle of Saul was much larger than the first little excavation had given reason to suppose. At Beitin, ancient Bethel, besides later remains showing that the city was inhabited almost continuously, a second campaign on a more extensive scale fully confirmed the results of preliminary soundings and showed that the city was occupied at the periods during which the Old Testament refers to it. Apparently it filled the place of nearby Ai in the economics of the region when the latter was unoccupied. Owing to the death of the sponsor, President Kyle of Xenia-Pittsburg Seminary, the excavation of Tell Beit Mirsim, supposed to be Kiryath Sepher, has been interrupted. The publication of the pottery by Doctor Albright and his interpretation of the results show how far the historical imagination can go in recon-

structing the ancient world from artistically uninteresting materials. The same may be expected from the forthcoming publications of Tell el-Ful and Beitin.

Another small undertaking of the American School, planned by Doctor Albright and carried out in January of this year after his departure by Mr. E. P. Blair and Dr. A. Bergman, was a series of soundings at 'Anata. They proved conclusively that the place could not have been the home of Jeremiah, for almost no remains of his period were found. On Ras el-Kharrubeh, however, just to the south, although the top of the hill is almost denuded, enough pottery of Iron Age II was found to convince Doctor Albright that it could have been the site of Anathoth, as Professor Alt had already suggested.

One of the fruitful excavations in Palestine has been that at Samaria by Harvard University, the Hebrew University, and other organizations. Begun by Lyons, Fisher, and Reisner before the war, it has been continued by Crowfoot, Lake, Sukenik, Miss Kenyon and others, from 1931 to 1935. Five campaigns have by no means exhausted the site but have brought many significant discoveries. The palace enclosure assigned to Ahab's time is the finest building yet known in Palestine from this period. Beautiful fragments of carved ivory, some of them inlaid like cloisonné in colors, give concreteness to the prophetic denunciations of the luxury of the age. Geometrical potsherds from Greece indicate commerce with that country as early as 800 B. C. Two thousand Rhodian jar handles testify to the continuation of these connections in the third and second centuries and the prosperity of the city at that time. A tantalizing find was a piece of local limestone with three delicately cut letters of an early Israelite inscription. Careful scrutiny of the pottery in the earth thrown against a tower of a type supposed to come from the Israelite period proved these towers and the attached walls to belong to Greek fortifications of the second century. A beautiful statue of Kore with her long torch in one hand and in the other a pomegranate and ears of wheat, symbols of death and resurrection, an inscription, and an altar testify to the worship of this goddess in the Roman period, the second to the fourth century. From the latter century comes the earliest chapel of the "first invention of the head of John the Baptist," with frescoes still partly preserved on walls and ceiling, one of the instructive finds of the expedition.

It is almost inexplicable that so little excavation has been done in

Galilee. The theater, forum, and adjacent buildings which Professor Waterman uncovered at Saffurieh (Sepphoris) call for further excavation in that important first-century city. Bethsaida Julias is still without a site. At Tiberias last winter Professor Sukenik investigated a structure which proved to be some kind of street monument, but the ruins of the city, in places only a few centimeters under ground, lie practically untouched. At Chorazin and Capernaum only the synagogues have received attention. Other extensive remains, some of well known cities, some without a name, both east and west of the Sea of Galilee, call for investigation.

One very important advance in knowledge has been made by Doctor Schneider's complete excavation of the ruin known as Khirbet Minyeh. The pottery found proves that the structure was an Arab castle of about 700 A. D. and thus completely destroys all claim of the site to be Capernaum. The city must have lain at Tell Hum. The remarkable mosaics of the "Church of the Multiplication of the Loaves" at et-Tabgha call for much more than the passing mention which is here possible.

At el-Hammeh below Gadara by the Yarmuk, where now a Palestinian Carlsbad is being developed about the abundant medicinal hot springs, the excavation of the theater and other buildings, including seats beautifully cut out of basalt near the Roman baths, proves how fully the Romans appreciated the value of these healing waters. On a mound a little farther to the west Professor Glueck found Bronze Age pottery and Professor Sukenik uncovered a sixth-century synagogue with remarkable mosaic floors, indubitable testimony to the number of the generations who have used the waters.

Recent years have seen other much-desired additions to our knowledge of Hellenistic, Roman, and Byzantine times in Palestine. Jewish scholars, such as Professors Sukenik and Mayer, have given attention to synagogues and other Jewish remains. During the winter and spring Professor Mayer has cleared the greater part of a large synagogue at Samu'a, south of Hebron, a building apparently very plain but with strong walls and interesting architectural features. Professor Sukenik's publication of the el-Hammeh synagogue, containing a mass of valuable information, appeared in the *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* last year. This spring the Department of Antiquities cleared and recorded the well preserved mosaic floor of a sixth-century synagogue which was accidentally discovered a little to the northeast of 'Ain es-Sultan at Jericho.

The historian's warm thanks are due the Department of Antiquities for clearing, recording, and preserving a large number of chance finds, tombs, mosaic floors, churches, and the like, many of which are threatened with destruction by the progressive modernization and industrialization of Palestine. Well trained members of the staff have given adequate professional attention to sites, especially of later periods, which other archaeologists have neglected. One of these is the great Crusader castle at 'Athlit, on which Mr. Johns has worked for years, and where churches and other structures have revealed new features of the life of the period. The work which Mr. Johns is now carrying on in the old Turkish citadel by the Jaffa Gate in Jerusalem is proving extremely important for a little-known period of the history of the Holy City. It is evident that extensive structures preceded the palace and towers of Herod the Great, but full interpretation of the remains must await further excavation and final publication.

At Jerash, the excavations begun by the British School for Yale University have been continued by the American School. A report soon to appear will tell of further clearances about the propylea church, the south and north tetrapyla, the north gate, the great hippodrome, and the triumphal arch. Valuable new inscriptions have come to light, most important of which is that from the arch, which dates its construction in the time of Hadrian's visit in 130 A. D. Artistically important is the chance discovery of a cave full of terra cotta figurines. Thus far, except for a small area cleared to the rock in 1930 and 1931, only buildings near the surface have been excavated. Significant finds surely await deeper digging. The period when Jerash flourished, probably from the third century B. C. to the Moslem conquest, is, archaeologically speaking, but poorly known in Palestine, in spite of its overwhelming importance for the history of Judaism and Christianity.

Doctor Glueck's discoveries of rock-carvings in the desert and of abandoned copper and iron mines, and the surveys which he, Professor Alt, and Mr. Frank have made in Wadi 'Arabah and Transjordan, all show how far earlier travelers have been from exhausting the archaeological wealth of Transjordan.

How much still awaits discovery is shown again by a tomb, discovered by villagers near Irbid, some twenty-five miles north of Jerash and excavated by the writer and Dr. A. Bergman this spring. A remarkably well drawn, delicately colored, and excellently preserved fresco, probably of the

third century A. D., was found in a very simple burial chamber. Traces of color in a neighboring tomb suggest that there must have been a school of painters there. These are but part of many evidences of the extent of culture in Roman Hauran. In an arcosolium of the tomb cleared was an almost life-size picture of a seated pair represented as Serapis-Pluto and Isis-Persephone, with a remarkable Cerberus on one side and a wool-basket on the other; below were three youthful female masks. Near Beit Ras, almost by accident, we came upon a strange carved drawing of the façades of buildings on a large horizontal rock surface. On the other side of the Jordan, near Sheikh 'Abreik in Galilee, a most remarkable series of Jewish catacombs of similar date came to light this spring.

One of the most successful excavations of the last year was that of the Colt expedition at 'Auja el-Hafir, sixty or seventy kilometers south of Beersheba. In the autumn Mr. Colt and his colleagues continued their clearance of the remains of the Byzantine city of Sbeita, where they uncovered interesting churches, baths, monasteries, and private houses, found numerous inscriptions, and had partially solved the puzzle of the existence of such cities in a desert country. To their great disappointment, lack of rain drove them to the much less promising site of 'Auja. The apparent calamity proved a blessing. Not only did the architectural remains prove more abundant than anticipated, but in rooms connected with two churches, in the midst of earth and refuse, they made the first extensive discovery of papyri in Palestine, over forty documents. The larger number are in Greek, of the sixth and seventh centuries, but several represent the earliest Arabic writing known in Palestine and some of the earliest found anywhere. There are business documents which will serve to picture the social and economic life of Palestine in the late Byzantine and early Arab periods. There are some ecclesiastical documents which promise light on the history of the Church and of religion, when they are fully deciphered. No discovery could have been more unexpected or more welcome. One cannot even guess what may come to light in other places in a land where so many of the great events of history have happened.

# The Reformation and Present Problems

ALBERT HYMA

THE so-called Age of the Reformation is one of the most difficult to analyze in the history of European civilization, for widespread misunderstanding of the ideals promulgated by Luther, Calvin and other leading Protestants during the sixteenth century has resulted in much confusion in this country.

It seems that during the past seventy-five years the American public has lost much of its former interest in pure religion. Even a man like Martin Luther is now hailed as an authority on political questions, although all those who have read his own works are forced to admit that his thought "was essentially unpolitical. . . . If he can be said to have had any ideal of the State, it was a theocratic ideal. But it would . . . be truer to say that he had none at all. Vaguely there floated before his mind a vision of a State ruled by the Word of God and by love and reason and natural law."<sup>1</sup>

The words just quoted were penned by an eminent British authority on political theories in the sixteenth century. This writer in turn reproduced an opinion by another expert,<sup>2</sup> with whom he, however, did not agree. The latter had made this astonishing statement: "Had there been no Luther there could never have been a Louis XIV."<sup>3</sup>

Just as astonishing is another statement by the second expert which, curiously enough, forms the introduction to the Reformation in one of the best works on European history produced in this country. It reads as follows: "The supreme achievement of the Reformation is the modern State."<sup>4</sup>

Turning to the economic history of Europe in the Age of the Reformation we meet with even greater illusion and delusion among serious thinkers in this country. Wornout theories on the rise of capitalism and its connection with early Protestantism find new adherents each year, largely because the original sources are very seldom consulted any longer. For-

<sup>1</sup> J. W. Allen, *A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century* (1928), p. 28.

<sup>2</sup> J. N. Figgis.

<sup>3</sup> J. W. Allen, *l. c.*, p. 29.

<sup>4</sup> H. S. Lucas, *The Renaissance and the Reformation* (1934), p. 417.



tunately, however, a great deal of excellent work has recently been done by the scholars of Germany and of other European countries, which will now enable us to obtain a correct understanding of the results of the Reformation.

The fifteenth and sixteenth centuries formed, as we know, an age of transition, similar in many respects to the period from 1830 to 1930. Revolutionary changes occurred in many phases of human thought and endeavor, exactly as has happened in the world during the past century and a half. Some of these changes had been long in the making, while others came with less preparation. A brief review of political developments and political theories during the later Middle Ages will help us realize how it has happened that mistaken notions like the two just mentioned originated and have found acceptance in this country for a long time.

To begin with, the modern State does not go back to the Reformation at all, and Louis XIV did not owe his theory of the monarchy by divine right to Luther. The opposite also is contrary to fact, namely, that the Protestants originated the idea of armed resistance to the State, as we shall learn presently.

Luther and most of the early Protestants were so supremely interested in religious issues that with Jesus of Nazareth they could say that their kingdom was not of this world. They were most assuredly no forerunners of absolutism in politics, and the absolute monarchy of James I of England and of Louis XIV of France owed them nothing at all.

Strange to say, it is also generally believed in this country that Protestantism introduced the principle of individual liberty in matters of religious beliefs as well as in political affairs. Each person is thought to have received through the Reformation the right to interpret the Scriptures as he sees fit. But if one carefully studies the lives of the great leaders among the Protestants, he will conclude that neither John Calvin nor John Knox nor Martin Luther after 1530 was a Protestant, according to the belief just described.

Furthermore, it is entirely misleading to argue that the Reformation ushered in a new theory in political realms. The leading Protestants before 1550 did not by any means stand for individual liberty. As long as they were in a small minority they clamored for toleration, but wherever they grew powerful enough to control a certain region they clung to the old

views on the need of conformity. Luther was very clear on the question of the rights of the individual in political matters as well.

In the year 1525, during the terrible Peasants' War in southern Germany, Luther advised the princes to kill their rebellious subjects without mercy: "As I wrote in my treatise against the peasants, so I write now. Let no one take pity on the hardened, obstinate, and blinded peasants who will not listen; let anyone who can and is able, hew down, stab and slay them as one would a mad dog." To the peasants he had written as follows: "You have taken up the sword—you shall perish by the sword. In resisting your rulers, you resist Jesus Christ."<sup>5</sup> It is obvious that in addressing the peasants Luther was guided by the precepts of Jesus. He was also directed by the force of circumstances, which made him write one day as a democrat and another day as the opposite.

Still more hopeless would be the task of the student who should feel obliged to prove the statement quoted above to the effect that without Luther there could not have been a Louis XIV. Luther's writings would have to be completely distorted to make them appear in favor of absolute monarchy. Again, the modern State could not possibly have been reared upon foundations like Luther's vacillating theories on government.

Melanchthon's position in matters of government is as vague and obscure as that of Luther. Likewise, it is of as little consequence. Government, so argued Melanchthon, is the outcome of the need for law and order among men, and it derives its authority from God. The will of God is represented by the government, but the form of government is of no importance, so he reasons. He said with his friend Luther that rebellion against the government is rebellion against Christ or God. Governments were limited, not absolute. But they were not to be limited by the consent of the people, nor by any compact or contract to be made between the ruler and his subjects. On the contrary, the limitation consisted in the Scriptures and natural law, as constantly repeated by medieval writers everywhere in Europe.

The Anabaptists and the early Baptists derived most of their political and religious views from reading the Bible and from medieval sects, especially the Waldensians. They did not favor rebellion against any established government, except what might be termed pacific resistance. Many of them refused to take oaths of any kind and to serve in armies. They

---

<sup>5</sup> Quoted from A. Hyma, *Luther's Theological Development from Erfurt to Augsburg*, pp. 75, 76.

hoped that laws against criminals would some day be repealed under the rule of the saints of God. In some measure they contributed to the demand for religious toleration.

John Calvin occupies an important place in the history of political theories in the sixteenth century. He studied law at Orleans; edited a work of Seneca (1532); and was thoroughly familiar with the *Corpus Juris* of Emperor Justinian. His *Institute of the Christian Religion* in its final form in Latin, as published in 1559, clearly indicated his view on political questions. The State, he reasons, is not the product of man's will. "For what could sinful man produce except carnal and foolish things?"<sup>6</sup> To inquire into the origins of government would be to doubt the wisdom of God, who had established the various forms of government as He saw fit: "It is not from the perversity of man that kings and other lords derive power upon earth, but from the providence and holy ordinance of God, whom it has pleased to manage in this manner the government of man."<sup>7</sup> The kings and princes were the vicars or lieutenants of God. It was the duty of the citizens to render obedience to the particular form of government established in the country or town in which they happened to be living. More than that, they must honor and revere the officials placed above them. "One cannot resist the magistrates without resisting God." And what should one do if the ruler was not just or fair? "Those who argue that one must render obedience only to just and fair rulers reason perversely."<sup>8</sup> The citizen must not investigate the duties of the ruler but his own duties. The latter are not at all affected by the wickedness of others.

Calvin admitted that nearly all rulers were far from just and wise. He actually went so far as to say that a prince who performed his duties properly was a miracle. Many were monsters of iniquity, but still they held their authority from God and were responsible to Him alone. "When we consider these things we shall not entertain the foolish and seditious thought that kings may be treated as they deserve or that because they fail in their duties to us we need no longer render obedience to them."<sup>9</sup>

In case the ruler wants his subjects to disobey the laws of God, the story will change considerably. Then the command of the prince or magistrate will have no weight at all, and it must not be carried out. That does

<sup>6</sup> Edition of 1559 (Latin), Book IV, p. 442.

<sup>7</sup> Book IV, p. 550.

<sup>8</sup> *Institute*, Book IV, p. 560.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

not signify, however, that now the subject receives the right to resist his ruler with arms or in any other forcible way. He simply must refuse to comply with the ruler in this particular instance. If this should lead to execution or imprisonment or loss of property, that is of no importance. The subject still may not rise against his ruler.

As late as 1561, Calvin still maintained his original position, as may be gathered from a letter written by him to Coligny. He wrote that in his opinion it would be better that all the children of God referred to by him should perish than that the Gospel of Christ should be dishonored by the shedding of blood. In that opinion Calvin simply continued to adhere to the commonly accepted views among both Roman Catholics and the early Protestants.

However, neither Luther nor Calvin could prevent the Lutherans and Calvinists after 1555 from deviating from the old-established theories. Under the pressure of warfare and persecution a number of pamphlets appeared among the Protestants in Germany, then in Scotland, and finally in the Netherlands and France, insisting that subjects did have the right to resist their respective rulers when the latter sought to destroy the "true religion." But this deviation from the path prescribed by Luther and Calvin was not in itself an innovation nor a contribution to the development of political thought.

In the *Defensor Pacis*, or *Defender of the Peace*, by Marsilius of Padua and John of Jandun we read some remarkable assertions about the powers delegated to the ruler by the people. The legislator is "the people of the community of the citizens, or the majority of them, determining, by their choice or will, expressed by word in a general assembly, that anything should be done or omitted regarding man's civil acts under pain of temporal punishment." This legislative power is the source of the authority of the ruler, who must observe the laws and compel his subjects to observe them likewise. If the ruler places himself above the laws, he ought to be resisted and corrected by his subjects, who form the legislative power which he himself represents.

These thoughts were written down in the first half of the fourteenth century by two authors who were befriended by Emperor Louis IV (the Bavarian) of the Holy Roman Empire. On the other hand, the immortal poet Dante strongly supported the doctrine of the monarchy established by the grace of God (divine right monarchy). We are also acquainted

with the remarkable views of Machiavelli. He sympathized with a prince who deliberately executed some of his subjects without regard to the principles of charity or justice, if the interests of the State demanded such action. Sufficient proof has now been given to show that the Reformation was primarily an attempted reform in the field of religion and church government, but not a movement of great importance in the history of political institutions or political thought.

In studying the history of economic ideas we meet with a similar problem as that just outlined. We have been told on every hand that "Protestantism, especially Calvinism, decisively encouraged individualism in economics as well as in religion. It promoted the spirit of thrift and economic ambition, the acquisition of wealth through shrewd dealings, and increased freedom in all forms of economic operation. . . . The Protestant revolt fully removed the stigma from personal enrichment through commercial pursuits, glorified trade and monetary profits, and laid the foundations for our present near-deification of the business man."<sup>10</sup>

In other words, the Reformation did the same in the field of economic thought as in that of political theory, according to a host of "new deal" critics who inject present conditions into the remote past. John Calvin and his followers in the sixteenth century are examined with a view to making the Reformation appear as the chief precursor of modern capitalism. Ingenious arguments are woven together which must prove that "Calvinistic countries and settlements everywhere show the expansion of industrialism and capitalism."

Once more, however, the student of European history should bear in mind that the Reformation was primarily a religious movement. Even Calvinism was an attempted return to the primitive Christian Church. Although John Calvin, unlike Martin Luther, founded a church in a prosperous city (Geneva), in which commerce and industry thrived, his attitude toward bankers and capitalists in general was not especially encouraging. He admitted that the payment of interest on loans was permissible even to a Christian, but no Christian should attempt to derive profit from such a practice. Most bankers he regarded as parasites, and he recommended that poor people were not to pay interest on loans at all. As a matter of fact, Calvin raised more obstacles to money-making than Melancthon did among the Lutherans.

<sup>10</sup> H. E. Barnes, *The History of Western Civilization* (1935), I, 861, 862.

During the middle of the sixteenth century the Protestants of England, who were for the most part Calvinists, were opposed to the taking of interest on loans. King Edward VI, advised by a leading Calvinist (Lati-mer), passed a law against interest (1551-1552).

The Calvinists in France, who are more generally known under the name of Huguenots, declared a banker unfit for the position of elder in the church. In the Dutch Republic the Calvinists were even more strict than those in France. A large number of Dutch bankers were actually excluded from participation in the sacrament of Communion (Holy Supper). In some regions the Calvinistic churches refused to accept money from a banker. When a large body of Calvinistic preachers assembled in the city of Emden<sup>11</sup> in 1571, they officially declared that the taking of interest and money-making pure and simple were unworthy of a Christian. In short, between 300 and 1650 not one important church in Europe fought so actively against capitalism as did the Calvinists.

However, it so happened that the Dutch Republic and England became important centers of commerce and industry. Both countries during the seventeenth century formed great colonial empires. In Amsterdam and London the most important banks of the seventeenth century were founded. Here also the most powerful commercial companies were organized. Consequently it is frequently argued that the commercial and industrial activity that developed in the two countries was largely the result of Calvinism.

When we examine this question in the light of medieval and modern history, we find abundant evidence that among Roman Catholics great industries were developed, as in Flanders during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, in Florence during the same period, and in Venice both before and after the period. The greatest centers of late medieval industry were to be found in the Low Countries and in Italy. Portugal was the first country to build up a vast colonial empire, while Venice and even "decrepid" Constantinople contributed immensely to the development of trade and of banking. Scotland, on the other hand, in which country Calvinism was most successful, was not noted for famous industries until the nineteenth century, when Calvinism had lost its original purity. Spain showed marked interest in the precious metals mined in America, while the

<sup>11</sup> Although Emden was located in Germany, the population spoke Dutch and was closely affiliated in religious affairs with the Calvinists in the Dutch Republic.



house of Fugger in Augsburg remained the model for all banking houses in Germany from 1500 until the nineteenth century.

Furthermore, it is scarcely fair to the men and women who flourished in the thirteenth century to say of them that they looked upon manual labor as unworthy of them. The Benedictine monks, for example, did not regard manual labor in that light. A skilled worker was not deemed contemptible by the leaders in the Roman Catholic Church. An industrious peasant was not scolded for his hard work. A banker was not excommunicated. High rates of interest were very common throughout the Middle Ages. In Constantinople, as we saw, trade and industry developed on a magnificent scale; and in that city rates of interest on loans were regulated carefully.

During the sixteenth century, hundreds of Lutheran and Calvinistic young men were sent by their parents to Italy to study bookkeeping and accounting there. These young men together with their parents paid tribute to the superior knowledge of the Italians in the field of pure money-making. And as for the highly successful Dutch merchants and captains of industry, they did not attain the height of their prowess until after they had diluted the Calvinism of their fathers with sophisticated worldliness. We know that the Dutch were well liked by the Japanese in the period from 1642 to 1800 because the former did not try to convert the latter to the Christian religion. The Portuguese, on the other hand, were driven out for the simple reason that they acted too much like missionaries.

It is indeed most unfortunate that in our age, when religion is at a discount, the history of the Reformation is so frequently depicted in a light resembling our own. Geographical factors should be consulted for the understanding of the Commercial Revolution and the rise of modern capitalism rather than the influence of Lutheranism or Calvinism.

It is indeed a pity that a professor of European history in a great state university should feel obliged to explain these simple facts in detail to his classes each year. Worse than that, more than four years after the present writer had published in one of his textbooks an account of the misunderstanding prevalent in this country, giving a reference to a German work in which these facts were fully discussed,<sup>12</sup> another historian was moved to read a paper before the annual meeting of the American His-

<sup>12</sup> See A. Hyma, *Europe from the Renaissance to 1815* (1931), p. 130. The German authority is K. Holl, the author of *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte* (see especially vol. I, pp. 468 to 506).

torical Association (December, 1935), in which the same subject was treated again.<sup>13</sup>

What does this mean, except that the "New History" does not want to give a fair amount of attention to the Christian Church and the Christian religion? When in a history of western civilization one fourth of one line is devoted to the *Imitation of Christ*, the most widely read book ever produced in Europe, and thirteen very large pages to Mohammedan learning and culture,<sup>14</sup> one may well wonder what has become of our vaunted enlightenment of the twentieth century. Karl Marx will naturally receive one whole chapter, but Thomas à Kempis must be content with a fraction of one line, while in many works dealing with medieval civilization he is not mentioned at all.

If the "New History" were merely a new way of writing and teaching history, it would not deserve mention in a religious periodical. But it happens that this "New History" is a symptom of our own age, a reflection of the thoughts of the average American citizen. For this reason it requires careful study and minute analysis.

What our age sorely needs is a man like Martin Luther, who will expose the weakness of the "blind leaders of the blind." We have also our humanists and our enlightened philosophers; we have also a Church which seems tottering on the brink of an abyss. There are millions of earnest men and women in this country of ours who faithfully support their respective churches, but who are profoundly disturbed about the future of the Christian Church. They know how difficult it has become to keep the young people in the Church. They realize the validity of many questions hurled at them by sophisticated students, both in public and private schools and colleges.

It is remarkable how much this situation resembles conditions in the Roman Catholic Church when Martin Luther began his course of lectures on the Epistle to the Romans in the year 1515-1516. Disaster upon disaster had befallen the Western Church. The so-called Babylonian Captivity (1307-1377) had been followed by the dreadful papal schism (1378-1418). Three worldly popes in succession claimed to represent Jesus of

<sup>13</sup> See *The American Historical Review*, vol. XLI (1936), p. 451: "Among many other views, it is interesting to note that Professor Bainton pointed out the unsoundness of Fanfani's argument that Protestantism aided in the rise of capitalism by releasing economics from the control of religion."

<sup>14</sup> H. E. Barnes, *l. c.*, vol. I, pp. 535-547 and 853. In the index to this volume the *Imitation* is not even mentioned, which goes to show that the most superb example of Christian mysticism is not so much as feebly appreciated.

Nazareth as head of the Christian Church. The first was Alexander Borgia (1493-1503), who openly recognized his son, Caesar Borgia, and his daughter, Lucrezia Borgia. The second was a scion of a prominent family in Genoa, the well-known Julius II (1503-1513), organizer of armies and of alliances. The third was Leo X (1513-1521), of the illustrious house of Medici, that banking house which under Lorenzo the Magnificent had proved a boon to artists and scholars. Leo X himself was a noteworthy patron of art. Instead of attempting to save the venerable Church of Saint Peter in Rome, he had to build an entirely new structure. Hallowed traditions meant very little to this "servant of Christ."

Perhaps the greatest threat to the stability of the Church was the spirit of skepticism and irreverence which had been fomented by the Italian humanists. Lorenzo Valla, although immoral and obscene, had found a cordial welcome at the papal court in his day. The great Erasmus and a host of other writers in the northern countries had read his works with the utmost enthusiasm. It is very unfortunate that these writers are so little understood today. Erasmus in particular is eulogized as the prince of the humanists. The humanists in turn are held up for praise as champions of enlightenment. Little does the average student in our universities realize how nearly these "liberators" undermined the Christian Church; how they scoffed at virtue; how unfair they were to the humble souls who endeavored to imitate the lowly Jesus.

The humanists in Italy, as one leading authority has well stated, through their passionate admiration for pagan antiquity destroyed their Christianity "without substituting the religion or the ethics of the old world. They ceased to fear God; but they did not acquire either the self-restraint of the Greek or the patriotic virtues of the Roman. It is not, therefore, a marvel that, while professing stoicism, they wallowed in sensuality, openly affected the worst habits of pagan society, and devoted their ingenuity to the explanation of foulness that might have been passed by in silence. . . . Under the thin mask of humane refinement leered the untamed savage; and an age that boasted not unreasonably of its mental progress, was at the same time notorious for the vices that disgrace mankind. These disorders of the scholars, hidden for a time beneath a learned language, ended by contaminating the genius of the nation."<sup>15</sup>

This may be said of the leading spirits of Italian humanism. It is

---

<sup>15</sup> See A. Hyma, *The Youth of Erasmus*, p. 40.

true that several excellent personages like Ficino and Pico della Mirandola are often classified among the Italian humanists; and these men differed considerably from Lorenzo Valla and his disciple, Erasmus of Rotterdam. But this must be borne in mind, that many of Valla's followers in the northern countries, led by Erasmus, did immense harm to the Christian religion.

When still a student in the University of Paris, Erasmus wrote as follows about the professors in his theological faculty: "They assert that the mysteries of this science [theology] cannot be comprehended by one who has any dealings at all with the Muses. . . . If you have touched good letters, you must unlearn what you have learned. . . . I do my best to speak nothing in true Latin, nothing elegant or witty. . . . I have only amused myself in making fun of some pseudo-theologians of our time, whose brains are rotten, their language barbarous, their intellects dull, their learning a bed of thorns, their manners rough, their life hypocritical, their talk full of venom, and their hearts as black as ink."<sup>16</sup>

There is no need of pointing out why Erasmus and other humanists of his day professed to be good Christians, although they flattered without discrimination, lied without compunction and wrote obscene literature without a qualm of conscience. Our task is to evaluate works like the celebrated *Praise of Folly* by Erasmus, which are said to have prepared the way for the Reformation. They could have done so only in a negative sense, for the regeneration of the Christian Church could not have come from such writers and from such books.

How well Luther understood that problem may be gathered from his own words. On March 1, 1517, he wrote: "I have read our Erasmus, and my opinion of him grows daily worse. I am indeed pleased that he stoutly and learnedly refutes both the monks and the priests, and condemns their inveterate ignorance. But I fear that he does not advance sufficiently the cause of Christ and the grace of God, in which he is more ignorant than Lefèvre. The human weighs more with him than the divine. It seems to me that not everyone who knows Greek and Hebrew is for that reason a Christian." And on January 18, 1518, he said: "There are many things in Erasmus which seem to me far from the knowledge of Christ."<sup>17</sup>

The very fact that a large number of historians in this country insist

<sup>16</sup> F. M. Nichols, *The Epistles of Erasmus*, vol. I, p. 144.

<sup>17</sup> A. Hyma, *Luther's Theological Development*, pp. 33, 41.

on calling the Reformation either the Protestant Revolt or the Protestant Révolution is an indication of the widespread misunderstanding of this movement. The term "Reformation" has been almost universally employed in Europe for more than three hundred years to designate the labors of Martin Luther and his followers. Protestants and Roman Catholics alike use it there without question. They realize that a reformation was badly needed, but no pope nor church council accomplished anything worth while until after the Reformation in Germany had run its course for thirty years. They also know the difference between humanists and reformers, although unanimity of opinion is found nowhere in Europe.

In this country it might be well for our students to take to heart the words spoken by the late Charles P. Steinmetz to Roger Babson: "I think the greatest discovery during the next fifty years will be along spiritual lines. Here is a force which history clearly teaches has been the greatest power in the development of man. Yet we have been merely playing with it, and never seriously studying it as we have the physical forces. Some day the scientists of the world will turn their laboratories over to the study of God and prayer and the spiritual forces which as yet have hardly been scratched. When this day comes the world will see more advancement in one generation than it has seen in the last four."

Our last economic depression, the breakdown of the League of Nations, the rise of dictators, the empty pews in our churches and the hopeless search of millions for "the peace that passes all understanding" reveal very clearly that another reformation must come, and that this reformation cannot be produced by modern humanists who seek to solve all our difficulties without recourse to aid from the Creator of the world, for they shall have to learn that spiritual forces cannot be generated here unless contact is made with God the Father and Christ our Saviour.

## The Social Sciences and Religion

CHARLES A. ELLWOOD

ONCE heard the president of a State university say in public that anyone could become educated by studying anything, provided he studied it long enough and in the right way. He gave as examples music and agriculture. Anyone with a good mind, he said, could become educated by studying long enough either of these two extremes in human culture. Perhaps we could agree with this university president if he had said "trained" instead of "educated." I think that his idea that a person can become educated by intensive narrow training in some one line, by coming to know as has been well said, "more and more about less and less," is pretty thoroughly discounted today. We now know that such training does not carry over to the whole personality and behavior of the one who receives it; that, indeed, such a specialist may be as ignorant and uneducated in some respects as the most illiterate in our population. Now, this idea of an education which shall aim at producing skill in some one line, whether it be language, natural science, or applied science; which shall aim at specialized skill, but not at the development of the whole man, is, I take it, something very far from the ideal of education professed by our church-related colleges. Yet, this idea has been so popular in American colleges and universities that unquestionably it still has a strong influence, even though it has been undermined by scientific psychological research and by practical experience. Our colleges still aim at what they call a practical education and still make opportunity, even if they do not insist upon it, for specialization in very narrow fields. They therefore fail too often to produce the broad-minded, intelligent citizenship which we have a right to expect our college graduates to show when they take their place in the community. Having considered their education to consist chiefly of individualistic training in some specialized field, and having failed therefore to get any general scheme of values in life, they are utterly confused when they confront social situations and responsibilities.

It has often been said in reply that the old-fashioned college was equally narrow and specialized; that it trained only for the three learned professions, the ministry, law, and medicine. I hold no brief for the old-



fashioned college, and I readily admit that its training was frequently as narrow, or perhaps narrower, than the education now provided for these three learned professions. However, these professions did deal with human problems, and the training for them was hardly as narrowing in its effect as the training which is now provided for those dealing with nonhuman problems. The expansion in our colleges has, until recently, been largely in the way of emphasizing the importance of these nonhuman problems, by which I mean problems in the physical and the material world. It is of course in these fields that the physical sciences have made their triumphs, and these triumphs have hypnotized all of us, the whole educational world, including even the church-related colleges. A few years back that high priest of modern finance, Mr. Roger Babson, speaking no doubt from a background of religious conviction, said that American universities ought to be heartily ashamed of their materialism. But I have not heard of any American university or college that has shown since the fruits of repentance along this line. Only the other day I took up a notice of a college in our Central West, famed for its religious influences, which was advertising an expansion. I found that the expansion consisted in establishing a Department of Commerce or "Business Administration." Perhaps this particular college was justified in this expansion. However, Departments of Commerce do not usually produce great spiritual and social leaders, and if I am not mistaken, our confused and troubled world needs education which will produce spiritual and social leaders, rather than leaders in commerce, in industry, in engineering, and in the physical sciences. I would not propose a moratorium in the training of leaders in materialistic lines. We still need achievement in these fields. What I am proposing is that our universities and colleges, and especially our church-related colleges, should throw more emphasis upon the training of leaders who know their human world, its desperate needs, and its present desperate maladies, and who have something more to propose than further material achievements to meet the situation. Our church-related colleges should recognize that their supreme duty, their sole reason for existence, is to train spiritual leaders.

I recognize fully the difficulties of church-related colleges in carrying out such a program. They do not exist in a world by themselves. They are not only influenced by the general educational tradition of the country, and by the demands of their students and their students' parents, but also sometimes, like state institutions, by the social, political, and economic

atmosphere. Their authorities and administrators have therefore great difficulties in combating the non-spiritual trends in modern education and in laying out a simple, clear path of duty for themselves. To this extent, we who are observers must be charitable. But it surely should help the authorities and administrators of our church-related colleges to have pointed out to them mistakes which have been made in our colleges and universities and the danger of following popular educational traditions. It is with this hope that I venture to speak plainly of the situation in church-related institutions of education.

I am not one of those who believe that the non-spiritual atmosphere of college life can be successfully combated by traditional religious instruction. I believe in such instruction if it can be given with a modern accent and with a modern outlook, and if it is not in contradiction with the education given in other departments of the college or university. The indispensable basis for formal religious instruction, if it is to be successful, must be the other courses given in the college curriculum. Traditional religious instruction does not go far with the mass of students and seems to have very little effect. It fails completely, except in a few instances, in changing the atmosphere of college life. In only a few institutions, indeed, is such instruction popular among the students. The reason is not far to seek. The problems which concern the great majority of American college students are fundamentally social. They are problems essentially of the student's adjustment to life, to his fellow human beings, and to the ideals and values of life. Some road must be found into the mind of the average college student which will show him the importance of spiritual factors in the lives of his fellow men in the community and in humanity at large.

Nor am I one of those who believe that the nonspiritual character of college education can be overcome by paying attention to the teaching of the natural or physical sciences. I would not deny that the processes of physical nature, and hence the physical sciences, afford one avenue of approach to the Deity. But it must be remembered that it has been just the development of the natural sciences with their insistence upon methods of measurement and the mechanical nature of all natural processes which has given rise to most of the skepticism and materialism among college students. To be sure, the most advanced physical scientists are now apparently repudiating the mechanistic approach to their problems. However, it is little short of pathetic to see the popular mind looking to such sciences as astron-

omy, physics, chemistry, and biology for evidence to support religious values. Certainly the natural sciences by their very nature and method afford the most indirect of all approaches to religion. I do not think that we can look to them for much help, no matter how they are developed. My friend and colleague, Professor William McDougall, in his little book on *World Chaos*, lays it down "that physical science has been the principal agent in bringing about the very rapid changes in our social, economic, and political conditions which are the source of our present troubles." I cordially agree with him, but I would also add that it has been the chief upsetter of the intellectual life of the mass of mankind, and especially of college students. It is very heartening that some physical scientists are perceiving this and are beginning to demand that scientific interpretation, particularly of life processes, be brought more into accord with experience and common sense. Nevertheless, I cannot imagine that we shall develop spiritual leaders among our college students by the fostering of the physical sciences, any more than I can imagine that Jesus of Nazareth could have matured His religious life through the study of physical nature as He saw it around Him. There is every reason to think that Jesus found His way to His religion through the history of His people and through the study and contemplation of the needs, the sufferings, and the aspirations of His fellow men about Him. It was particularly the needs and sufferings of the human world which led Jesus to proclaim His Gospel, His good news, regarding human redemption. I am persuaded therefore that the intelligent college student of today will find his way to Christ most easily and most clearly through the understanding of the condition, needs, and possibilities of men. He will then see the need of a socially and personally redemptive religion such as Christ taught. Human society, in other words, through its very defects, as well as through its achievements, shows the need of God and of Christ more clearly than anything else that we can study.

I believe, therefore, that the study of human society, if properly pursued, can be very useful to religion, and supremely useful in the training of spiritual leaders. Systematic knowledge of the condition, needs, and possibilities of men is to be found only in those bodies of knowledge which we term the social sciences. If the task of religion is to save the world from evil, religion must seek the aid of the social sciences. Religion cannot work successfully toward this task in the modern world without the knowledge of the forces which make and mar the lives of men. That these forces are

social no longer admits of any doubt. Religious workers need both extensive and intensive knowledge of our civilization, of its present condition and character, and especially of the elements in it which so often produce the confusion and personal disintegration found among our young people.

Religion has long emphasized that the natural man must be transformed, that his selfish impulses must be sublimated and replaced by altruistic ones. The social sciences find that this is entirely possible if the individual is surrounded by a culture, a social atmosphere, which stimulates the development of the nobler, more altruistic impulses and emotions. Nothing is clearer in the social sciences than that the same individual, according to the culture in which he is reared, may be either a savage or a civilized man, a criminal or a saint. The social sciences find that human character is not only indefinitely modifiable through the culture of the groups with which the individual is associated, but indefinitely modifiable in the direction of the attainment of higher Christian character. Moreover, the social sciences indicate that we have not yet begun to fathom the possibilities of man's social life through the molding power of group traditions, group morale, and group spirit. Examples in human history of the transformation of whole peoples through the power of group tradition and morale are numerous. We can even see the same result in many smaller groups around us, such as the family, which often take ordinary individuals and mold them into something extraordinary through the power of their tradition or spirit. Here comes in, of course, the social significance of the Church as an ideal social group. Just as the individual is low or high in his social and ethical development according to the culture of his group, so the group itself in its inner organization, unity, and harmony, is low or high according to the morale or discipline which prevails among its members. Accordingly the possibilities of human social life which may be realized through the work of ideal groups, such as the Church, are only beginning to be explored; but the explorations already made by the social sciences indicate that human societies can attain to a much higher degree of social justice, social unity, and social harmony, than they now generally exhibit.

It has been the claim of Christianity that it has attempted to teach men brotherhood, sympathy, co-operation, and mutual service, more than any other religion. If this is a large part of its redemptive work, then again the social sciences can be of the greatest aid. The scientific study of human society shows that all civilization has been built up through co-operation,

that culture comes not so much through the learning of individuals, as through the co-operative efforts of groups. Moreover, the study of the present social problems of our world shows the need of maximizing harmony and co-operation among men and of minimizing hostility and conflict. Something like the universal love which Christianity has tried to preach to mankind is therefore indicated by the study of the problems of human society. The social sciences seem to confirm the teachings of Christianity through their very emphasis upon the necessity of harmony and co-operation among men, and of minimizing hostility and conflict. If this is true, then the humanistic and social sciences should be made central in the education furnished to their students by the church-related colleges of our land.

But it may be replied to this argument that no subjects have proved more upsetting to college students than these humanistic and social sciences as they have been taught in some institutions. If they are *wrongly* taught, there can be no doubt that this is so. Moreover, it is not easy to find a way which will guarantee that they will be *properly* taught. Just as our civilization is divided by the struggle between those who represent materialistic interests and those who stand for spiritual values, so also are the social sciences. They are not abstract disciplines apart from life, but they inevitably reflect the conflicting traditions and the struggles which are going on in our civilization. Moreover, the very development of the physical sciences has made it difficult to develop the social sciences upon a humanistic or humanitarian basis. The concept of pure science, as developed by the physical sciences, is almost devoid of all human values. The very theory of knowledge on which the physical sciences of the nineteenth century were based, namely, that all knowledge comes from sense impressions, prepared the way to deny the possibility of scientific knowledge of the higher human values in the field of the social sciences. Science was to be limited to what could be weighed and measured, and, almost arrogantly, the natural sciences assumed that they were alone entitled to be called "science." Perhaps it would be in some cases expedient, because there has been such misunderstanding, to drop the term "social sciences" and speak only of social studies. This is as true of economics, political science, anthropology, and sociology, as it is of history and ethics. However, the very fact that I have used the word, "science," almost necessarily in naming one of these fields of knowledge indicates a difficulty here. Probably we shall not solve our problem by simply changing our terms. All of these studies can be taught in such



a way as to destroy higher spiritual values whether they are called "sciences" or something else. Even the problems of Christian education do not permit of merely verbal solution.

The truth is that there is no solution of this problem of Christian education without critical attention to the personality of the teacher. It may not matter quite so much what philosophical and religious ideas are held by a teacher of chemistry; but philosophical and religious ideas and ideals become immensely important in the case of the teacher of any one of the social studies. This, I think, is coming to be recognized to some extent in the church-related colleges of the United States. But I am persuaded that it is not recognized as much as it should be. I am not referring, of course, to the matter of theological orthodoxy, but rather to that Christian idealism which has been the source of all effective Christian leadership. I once heard the president of a college renowned for its Christian atmosphere say that the manifest need of the church-related colleges was more and better Christian teachers. He made a powerful plea for Christian idealism as the basic thing to be considered in hiring teachers for a Christian college, though he did not refer particularly to the need of such an idealistic outlook for the social science teachers. At the conclusion of his address, I could not help asking him if his son, who was the president of a great university, put his precepts into practice in selecting the teachers for that institution. He replied: "Oh, no; the situation there is different. Only competence of the teacher in his special line can be considered." I leave you to decide whether this college president was justified in making this reply. To be sure, academic competence in any institution is a supreme consideration. But I cannot help but remark that interest in religion, enthusiasm for Christian ideals, and even active religious work, ought not to count against a man when he is considered for an academic position, either in a university or college, church-related or not, as I have known it to do in several cases. Perhaps in all of these cases, the college authorities were more or less misled by the advice given by the representatives of the various scientific fields concerned. This only shows, however, how much the general attitudes prevalent in our civilization affect the decisions and policies even of our church-related colleges.

I have placed my finger upon the sorest spot in the administration of our church-related colleges. It is acknowledged, on the one hand, that the highest degree of competence in their special fields must be sought when



men are appointed on their faculties. On the other hand, it is also acknowledged that the men who are appointed on these faculties should support and defend Christian ideals, both social and personal. These two principles have not been made to work harmoniously together. When they are made to work harmoniously together, we shall find the solution of the problem of academic freedom in the church-related colleges. The teacher is a minister and servant of the truth, quite as much as the religious worker. He must indeed believe that all truth is the word of God. Therefore any infringement in his freedom to teach the truth as he sees it is essentially an infringement upon conscience. What then should be the attitude of the church-related college toward a man in the humanistic or social sciences who teaches a materialistic view of human nature, a purely cynical view of human history, and a pagan social ethics, and does so with the utmost sincerity? The answer is obvious, that in the first place such a man should not have been appointed. The church-related college has a distinct mission in our society, to sustain the Christian ideal of life and to train spiritual leaders for the realization of that ideal. It is not an infringement upon conscience to refuse to employ a man whose general philosophy of life does not fit in with its purpose. After he is appointed, his position becomes inviolate unless he is guilty of misconduct. But if his purposes, aims, and aspirations are not those of the church-related college, he surely cannot complain if he is not employed.

To those of us who are stalwart believers in the truth of Christian ideals, there is no fear in pursuing this path. Both the scientific study of human society, the condition, needs, and possibilities of men, and Christian ideals will lead to the same conclusion. We see, therefore, no excuse for the present moral confusion in our human world. We are morally confused only because we have lost sight of the teaching of the great Master Teacher; or because we fear that His teaching may apply only to a few phases of life. It is surely the duty, as well as the privilege, of the church-related college to take the lead in overcoming the present moral confusion of our human world. It can do so, however, only as it stands by the teaching of the Great Master with unflinching loyalty, and has undaunted faith that no adequately understanding knowledge of human life can possibly lead men away from that teaching.

# The Struggle for International Sanity

FREDERICK W. NORWOOD

**I** OFTEN wonder what our great-great-grandchildren will think of this era through which we are now passing. If the forces which are at present dominant in the world roll on to their logical conclusion they will issue in world-shaking catastrophe unless there be a change; perhaps through the emergence of inspired leadership with a genius for peace as other men have a genius for war; perhaps by means of a great religious revival; perhaps by means of some of those incalculable providential accidents which have again and again deflected the course of history. Nobody can prophesy concerning the present condition of things. The fate of our great-great-grandchildren will be conditioned by one or other of these major alternatives. If they should be the fortunate beneficiaries of the conquest of war by their fathers they will look back with amazement upon the folly of their ancestors so iron-bound, so autointoxicated in the midst of magnificent opportunities. If they should unfortunately have to live their lives after a great world collapse they will be again hard beset pioneers hewing and blazing their way toward the common decencies of life which would have been ruthlessly sacrificed. Nobody knows save God.

But there is no occasion for despair. There never was a time when courage was more imperative; there never was a time when cowardice was more fatal. It is our job who believe in God not to inspire men with fatalism or with terror, but to try to see the truth clearly, to think our own way through individually, and above all to stand firmly with the great truths that are embedded in our holy religion. In the eyes of most thoughtful people all the world around, our present world condition is a condition of insanity. They are not permitted to say it in many places, they refrain from saying it from motives of discretion. Even as it is, it is doubtful if they would endure the present condition only that they are led to believe that the insanity is in other nations rather than in themselves. By means of propaganda and intense pressure, and not without iron discipline and dire threat against disobedience, do they for the most part stand patiently, though doubtfully, in the ranks today. We might be surprised

at the strength and unanimity of conviction which has come to the sons of men.

Another reason for the feeling that we have somehow blundered into the realm of irrationality is enforced upon us by the observation of the futility of war. Many of us are old enough to remember 1914 and to have lived through the long weary post-war years which though less spectacular have been not less desolating than the actual years of the titanic conflict. As we look around the world today we who are old enough or have read enough are appalled by the resemblance that there is between 1914 and 1936.

In 1914 Germany was regarded as the supreme example of a nation in arms that the world had ever seen. She was in definite alliance with Austria-Hungary which was virtually her vassal, and with Italy which stood, as it were, halting with one foot in either camp, but was definitely pledged to the central alliance. On the other hand England and France maintained what was called the Entente Cordiale, with the Russia of the Czardom, which the Central Powers, and particularly Germany, believed to be encircling. The Balkans were in a state of chaotic confusion. China was reeling under a devastating revolution which three years before had overthrown her monarchy and disrupted her civilization. Japan was believed to be the rather docile pupil of the West, and was called upon to police the Pacific. America was stately, aloof, as distant as the stars. The nations were armed to the teeth, and the burden of their armaments and the fear of some other power's getting in the first blow caused the entire edifice to shake and reel. Men felt that the existing position was intolerable, something had to be done to reform and rebuild the world. They began in 1914.

It was the most colossal experiment the world has ever seen in world reforming and world rebuilding. The exponents of the experiment grouped themselves into two parties, but their slogans and their watchwords were virtually the same. Humanity gave to its political leaders and its military leaders in those days everything it had. It gave up its manhood virtually in totality. Only those were exempt, who held what were said to be key positions more valuable at the rear than they would have been at the front, and the immature and the infirm. Humanity placed at their service virtually its entire womanhood, who both practically and sentimentally supported their experiment with a zeal and a sacrifice that have never been

eclipsed. Humanity poured into the coffers its incalculable reserves of wealth. All the gold that had been painfully mined all round the world was not sufficient, its thin trickle became inadequate in less than two years. But humanity stood by the great experimenters so devotedly, so patiently, that having no real money, it coined it, printed it, levied taxes upon it for the mortgaged lives and prospects of its children, grandchildren, and its great-great-great-grandchildren. All the money in the world was given to these reformers. All the commerce of the world was given to these reformers, put under their supervision, and such parts as stood in their way they suppressed. Humanity put at their service all its literature, the keenest brains in the world, the most influential writers who in press or in pamphlet enhanced their vast experiment. Humanity virtually submitted to the strictest control of its speech. If men broke the silence in hostility to the experimenters they were silenced in one way or another. Humanity put behind these men all its religious, and moral, and spiritual resources. For a few short years, save for a few faint voices, the actual resources of the Christian faith as well as of other faiths were put at their service and for four and one half years humanity rocked and reeled and strained, with incredible valor, with unthinkable sacrifice.

And now that eighteen long years have rolled away since the experiment was declared to have succeeded, we look round on the world once more and it has not changed. The alignment of nations is virtually the same. Germany is once more the supreme expression of a nation in arms, responsive apparently to a single will under the incalculable leadership of Hitler instead of under the tradition ruled league of the Kaiser. Austria-Hungary has been dismembered, but the Austria that is left is lamb-like in its adherence to Germany. Italy remains still rather dubious, but no longer disrupted and impotent under the iron leadership of Mussolini, even yet with a foot in either camp, still a member of the League of Nations, still a feared member of the central alliance. Britain and America are just as they were, still allies; both of them protesting their abhorrence of war, but both of them having been driven into much more abundant preparation for war. And still Russia is there to complete the Entente Cordiale; not the old, slow, disorganized Russia of the Czardom, but the highly organized nation upon a hair trigger under the Bolsheviks. And once again the cry is raised by the Central Powers that Russia is completing their encirclement. The Balkans are in greater confusion than ever. Japan is no longer the

policeman of the Pacific; to most eyes she looks like the racketeer of the Pacific. America is still aloof, still among the stars, still potent and ultimately decisive, but still undecided.

All that has happened is that the aspect of the god Mars has radically changed. His face has always been stern and forbidding, but now it is horrid, fantastic. In place of the old sheaf of the ancient mythology his hands are now full of bombs; in place of the sword he once carried there circle round his head dark birds of death, swift-flying, destruction-dealing; instead of fire, poison gas proceeds from his nostrils.

What was the Great War for? Why did our sons and brothers die? What had they done? There was no question of their valor, of their deep faith, but somebody ought to answer to them. If they could come marching down upon us, a great spiritual army, they would reduce us to silence. What could we say to them? Why did they die? What was it all for? I know how these questions hurt, but it is no discredit to your boys any more than to die on Calvary was a discredit to Jesus. They did their part, but I want to know what their part was. What did they mean, who asked it of them, what did they do? To whom did they give so much?

I want to say after the sufferings of those Gehenna years, and the long meditation of post-war years, that obviously we were off the mark. We were not doing what we thought we were doing. There must have been victories which we had not taken into account, and those factors were so real that they have emerged again like some great rock emerging from the sea from a storm, the same rock. Nothing has changed.

Obviously our greatest faults were after the war in the making of peace. My dear American friends, you were really the most responsible nation of all. We could not have carried on for more than half the time without you. Long before you came into it you gave us your money in millions. Our money was spent, all the nations were reeling on the edge of financial catastrophe, but your money kept the wheels of death rolling. The money, as you know, was spent in your own country for the making of armaments and stores of various kinds. It stimulated your industry for the time being and you were in the fortunate position that the money was still owed to you. I understand it is still owed to you. And I think that is the most shocking thing that happened. I would rather Great Britain had lost a colony or two than to have failed in her word. The repercussions of that moral collapse have shaken the world to its foundations. At the same time

it was impossible to pay, and as for the moral right of it, if you were not in the war until 1917 then you must have been profiteering on the war, and if you were really in the war, as you said, after 1917, then we paid in blood. You paid with less blood.

But the most terrible thing of all was the victory you bought us. I hope you will never come in again, I do not want you. I don't think you can keep out, but I don't want you! May America remain one sane land in the midst of a distraught world if she can. But you see when both sides, after more than three years of heart-rending, brutal, bloody struggle were on the point of exhaustion you arrived with the splendor of the rising sun upon you, with all your incredible resources of men, money, and material, and the war collapsed. But you had driven the victors mad. They who might have come to a pitiful ending, saddened and subdued, ready to compromise, now thought they rode upon clouds and could settle the world as they saw fit. Then they plunged into an orgy of foolish reparation, of an attempt to maintain the status quo. We sat down in the peace conference and decided what to do with the defeated, and never so much as allowed them to cross the doormat at the conference. We carved the world as we saw fit, carving the territories like the spoils of battle. It gave us the League of Nations. It was the best thing we got, but its parentage has always been a bit doubtful. It was left on Europe's doorstep; it has suffered from rickets and debility ever since, but for the moment it was a gilded façade which obscured from our eyes the fallacies and brutalities of the Versailles Treaty. We said it is all right, the League will slowly win out and as men's passions die down they will rectify some of these mistakes.

You deceived us, my beloved. You did not mean to, I am not blaming you. I don't know of a nation in the world I blame. I could weep for every one of them. From their own point of view they are all right, all just, there isn't a nation in the world that has ever dreamed of repenting. And whenever you go to other countries, and I have made it my business to go to most of them, and talk with decent thoughtful people, as they express their country's policies you feel that the facts are largely with them, and at any rate what they are doing is quite natural. I am not blaming you at all. Any other country would have done much the same as you did. There is only one moment when I get angry with you, and it is because I love you, and that is when you tell me you are neutral. You never were, you are not, and you never will be neutral because you are too



big. God Almighty has given you the most secure bit of territory there is on the globe, with resources that make you virtually invulnerable from the war point of view, and yet you are spending more money on armaments than any other nation in the world. And when J. L. Garvin wrote an article the other day in Britain saying that England needed more armaments quickly, that we must get them from America, and she had better pay off the American debt and get you to make airplanes and guns for us; the ink was hardly dry on the pages of the *Observer* when your munitions makers were speeding to England to get the orders! You are not neutral and never will be. If the world goes in collapse you will come in, more slowly, but you will come in.

Even if you went the whole length and said we will not fight or trade, don't forget you have seventy per cent of the world's oil and will you suggest to me anything that moves that does not require oil. When the world happens to be fighting for its bare life it will want to know something about oil, and even if you were to stop exports your people would be out of work and they would want to know why. They would take sides, they would say, Let us end it, this side rather than the other. Either you would follow your honor if nations have honor, or you would follow your dollars.

We are all off the track. We have all sinned and come short of the glory of God. Don't imagine for a moment that I am putting in a plea for Britain, I am not. You see I am an overseas Briton anyhow. I do not deny or discredit any racial heritage, but I have lived long enough to make resolute attempts through the years to think in terms of humanity and only secondly in terms of nationality. We have all sinned and come short of the glory of God. But when they say to us, as they are saying to us, the only way out of the impasse is another war, I want to speak with them if I can.

I would like to meet the rulers and militarists and say to them: "What would you like us to give that we did not give the last time? We gave you all our men, money, trade, literature, all our speech, and almost all our faith. What more do you want? What can you promise us? You can promise us a more horrid struggle, no distinction between combatant and noncombatant, you can promise us death dealing ways more diabolical than the last, but what with regard to the world? What do you expect to do?" They would say, for they never learn anything, "If we only have a complete victory then we will organize the world aright." But my friends, could you

imagine a more complete victory than they had? It was absolute, with your assistance, and that was the snare. It was so complete that their little prejudices and greeds and scruples blinded them to the fact there is something indestructible in man. After all you cannot suppress a great nation, you only build up for yourself a vengeance that is to come.

What should be the Christian attitude, one wonders at a time like this. I know of course to you it is a cooler question than it is to me. I am finding a different England from the one of a few short weeks ago, and I am going to live here all the rest of my life I trust, and I do not see how they in office can help it. Certainly I do not see how any government could do other than virtually what ours is doing. The people would demand it as your people would, and I know our leading men sufficiently well, and I am charitable enough to say they do not want war; they think they are holding off war in the only way that is left to them. The same conditions would occur in your country if it were geographically placed as my country is.

I am not content with the mere pacifist position, I am not content to say I will take no part in it, and will get all the people I can to take no part in it. That is my position, that is where I am for the rest of my life, but I consider that a merely personal affair. I don't think it matters much anyhow. What does it matter if they put me in jail? It is rather stupid, because I am much more useful outside than in, because I am one of the few people who talk sense. What does it matter if they shoot me? I have taken the risk of being shot often enough. I would just as soon be shot against a wall as be asphyxiated by poison gas, or be blown to bits by high explosive. I don't consider those things worth talking about.

I want to say a few simple things. One is that if the world really means to have peace it must recognize where the problem is. It isn't in poor men and women who are driven and coerced. The real problem is that we are living in a different world from what we suspect we occupied. Hundreds of years we have been fighting against scarcity, and now by the grace of God, through inventions and discoveries of man, inspired by His spirit, we have made the world an incredibly fruitful place, and have made machines incredibly potent. And the real truth is that we have not a system that is adapted to that. Every nation in the world can now manufacture all it wants to manufacture; in fact any nation in the world could supply the whole world with manufactured goods if the whole world was content to buy from it. There was a time when certain countries produced

certain goods and they could be got only there, but now through chemistry and science we can make the rubber that used to grow in certain countries only, grow in any country, and if you really wanted to do it you could grow it in Massachusetts. You can even make synthetic rubber. If you would only let the machines of little Japan go freely she could make you everything you want. The trouble is you do not want it. And my country of Australia, 3,000,000 square miles of land and not the population of New York—if you only wanted wheat, wool, or fruit could flood you with it and still have enough to serve Asia and Europe. That is the world we are living in, but we have a system in which we are all organized to sell if we can, but not to buy. Long before we go to war we build ramparts of tariffs.

We are in a new world, a great world bigger than the last, nobler than the last, but we have not a policy that fits it, and if we mean peace we must be busy about that. Don't talk in terms of guns and accidental conclusions of an unsolved problem. Let us talk in terms of God's abundance and the needs of men, and the freeing of the world from bondage. I should estimate that would require a century or two, for in spite of Mr. Townsend and even Father Coughlin, it could not be done in a decade. But when your country was born the world knew nothing about the lands outside of Europe. People who came to your great country were daring fate and fortune, putting their lives to the test. Through the long centuries we set out to explore, and map, and chart, and even exploit the world, and we have succeeded. Now we have to begin again, and if it takes another three or four centuries it won't matter much so long as we are on the road looking in the right direction.

Secondly, if we mean to have peace we must organize for it. I do not see how we can get along without an armed force any more than you can see how to dispense with your police force and all the officers of the law, but I do not think it should be made a race among the nations as to which could have the heaviest armament, ever set ready to go off, and driving people frantic with terror. Let us get organized for peace and bring justice in peace; let us sweep away the terrible treaties and pacts which everyone signed under terror, or needless conquest and the bitterness of defeat. Let us begin to fashion national law, and put behind the law the only force that is ultimately adequate—that is moral force. But in the meanwhile see that the law can be enforced against the law-breaker. You say you do not want to come into the League of Nations; I do not wonder. You do not want

to be mixed up with Europe; I do not wonder. But are there any conceivable conditions at all under which the world would know how to calculate on America, how to be sure that in the case of a lawbreaking nation America would not profiteer, but would support the law, and even repress the lawbreaker. Not with war, but with police methods guarding definite points that were under attack. This making of peace is the biggest job humanity has ever faced, and we have to face it. Nine tenths of the peace talk is "blah."

And then our first responsibility is to God. That is where we ought to stand, and whatever happens nothing should ever make us say that war is of God. Don't let us ever again commit the atrocity of trying to square war with Jesus. Rather go down with your colors flying than that. I may be caught in war and I am ready to serve my country to the last ounce of my ability, but I shall never cease to pray every day of my life for any nation whatsoever that may be my country's enemy. Never. And if I could serve any one of them I would. Though I might have to take part in some organized effort to resist their thrust, I pray God I shall never again forget they are poor human beings like I am, driven like I am, held in a complex social system like I am, and they are not my enemies. They are my opponents, and the law of love still holds.

Don't be pessimists. I tell you again God still lives in history, God has turned the whole course of events not once or twice, but thousands of times by unforeseen incalculable accidents, as men call them. It may happen, I don't know. Nothing would be more helpful than a great revival of religion. Get people to God and you have them on the side of peace. That is our job.

And finally, lift up your heads and rejoice. This is the greatest age the world has known. It is our poor blind policies that obscure its glory, and since we would not meet conditions by prayer of heart and conscience then a more stern providential crisis overshadows us until we waken. When we have wakened either in our own time or in our children's or children's children's time there will be a saner, cleaner, nobler era in which our descendants will live and from which they will look back upon this era in which we live as a period of temporary insanity of the race and give God thanks, if only their direct ancestors have had the grace, and gumption, and "guts" sufficient to do their job from day to day and still believe that the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.

# Washington Gladden—and After

GAIUS GLENN ATKINS

THE only way to understand any movement, one may hold, is to try to understand as far as possible the men in whom it lived and moved and had its being, and to trace to their sources the tides which carried them and which they, by their own contributions, both fed and directed. One would then examine the forces which deflected or defeated the movements with which they were associated and enquire whether they might have had foresight enough to anticipate them, or if they did anticipate them had a power they did not exercise to prevent them. Only in these ways are the verdicts of history just.

## I

The editors of RELIGION IN LIFE are graciously willing to permit one who knew and greatly loved Washington Gladden to try to do something like that for him and his work, since for many reasons the case for and against nineteenth-century religious liberalism can be rested with him as its typical representative.<sup>1</sup> It cannot be done adequately in any magazine article and what is here done is deeply colored by the writer's affection and gratitude. One cannot write detachedly of a man who at a strategic time directed all the after current of one's own life and whose friendship is one of the unfading lights of those lengthening years in which more and more the memory of friends becomes a crescent treasure.

Doctor Gladden has happily left us an account of his own life. His *Recollections*, like John Ruskin's *Praeterita*, have the quality of mellow, autumnal light, touched a little with the sadness of things which therein lose their sharpness and through which, as the sun sets, one discerns the promise of the stars. He came of sound New England stock. His father, Solomon Gladden, was teacher; his grandfather, Thomas, a shoemaker; his great-grandfather, Azariah, a soldier who shared with Washington the bitter Valley Forge winter.

His father died while the boy was a very small boy indeed, but he lived long enough to have done much for his little son. After his father's

<sup>1</sup> This also is his centenary year—born February 11, 1836.

death the boy was passed about from relative to relative. He does not speak of himself as unhappy, but it must have been a rather troubled time for the little chap who was sent first to Massachusetts to live with his father's people and then brought back to New York to live with his mother's people; all this in farm wagons or one-horse carriages over unspeakably rough roads, or by the Erie Canal. Such experiences left him with vivid memories of both New England and New York farm life more than ninety years ago.

He spent his adolescent years with a maternal uncle, a farmer in Owego, N. Y., literally apprenticed out, sharing an austere and laborious family life. "I learned," he says, "to use the axe, the saw, the hoe and the spade and the rake; the scythe and the plow, and the grain cradle came into my hands as soon as I was able to use them." Books were the one recreation and solace of his laborious boyhood. They spent the evening after the chores were done reading aloud, sometimes by the light of pine knots, more often by a tallow dip held close to the page. His uncle, an admirable reader, taught the boy to read aloud by reading—and how nobly he read. The boy who sat by the fireside with the light from the open hearth making flickering shadows on the lowly walls, while his mind traveled with Taylor on his journey up the Nile, or with Hannibal over the Alps, was rarely fortunate.

His interest in politics began early, since a great issue was then beginning to shape itself. It compelled re-definitions of democracy in terms of Christian morality and new estimates of the worth of a man, whether his skin be white or black. But religion was the deepest interest of his adolescence. He was, he says, "keenly alive to all the good things of this world, but underneath it all was an increasing craving for that spiritual experience of which I had heard others testify, and which I believed to be the supreme good. My early boyhood had been bathed in an atmosphere of piety. Every memory of my father wore a cloak of sainthood, and in my uncle's household religion was a vital element, commended to me in conduct whose sincerity I could never question." And yet in spite of all this he was long in finding inner peace.

He wonders why he did not become an atheist. "It was the memory of my father," he says, "and the consistent piety of my uncle which made that impossible, but that little plastered room under the rafters in the old farm house where I lay so many nights looking out through the casement



upon the unpitied stars, has a story to tell of a soul in great perplexity and trouble, because it could not find God." It was not until his eighteenth year that he found the light he sought; that it was perfectly safe for him to trust the heavenly Father's love, waiting for no rapture but doing His Father's will and confiding in His friendship.

## II

It began to be evident that he deserved a better chance "than a good horse or \$100." His uncle released him from his apprenticeship and he went to Owego Academy to fit for college. He worked for a while in a printing office (the office is still there, not much changed, they say), learned to set type, took his first lessons in journalism, determined to study for the ministry, and in due time went to Williams. He paid his debt to his Alma Mater with a lifelong loyalty and one of the noblest of American college songs—"The Mountains." He graduated in 1859, and through the August twilight watched from the windows of the train which bore him westward the summits of Greylock and Prospect as they lost themselves in the darkening sky, with the consciousness that the curtain had gone down upon a rich experience and risen on the unknown. He returned to Owego as a teacher, but schoolmastering was not his trade. He began to preach under the tutorship of Moses Coit Tyler, and was licensed to preach by the Susquehanna Association of Congregational Ministers. (His certificate of license was in Thomas K. Beecher's handwriting.)

He was in Brooklyn through five years pregnant with destiny. He heard Beecher unleash the lightning in his sermon "Against a Compromise of Principle." He saw Lincoln "strong, benign but unspeakably sad" ride down Broadway to Cooper Union. He read Robertson and Bushnell and found in their throbbing pages "the appeal to life" which was always afterwards the motif of all his preaching; he shared the long agony of the Civil War, the doxologies sung at the end of it, the sorrow of the nation when "night fell on noon."

The six years in North Adams which followed were significant. Purely doctrinal preaching was beginning—at least in Western Massachusetts—to lose its power of appeal; both preaching and religious thought needed to be redirected. There was a widening and portentous gap between inherited faith and emerging thought forms and forces, between a highly individualistic ethic and emerging social forms and forces—in a sentence,

between religion and life. Robertson and Bushnell had taught him that the power of religion was in its "appeal to life." He was by every faculty fitted for such a transition period. He had an unusual gift for the application of Christianity to life, along every sector of its embattled front. His North Adams preaching became increasingly an appeal to life in a form for which the time was eager. His sermons were good copy for the *Springfield Republican*; his Sunday evening addresses became a little book. He was learning to use his pen and so to reach a congregation far beyond the New England hills. That faculty grew with the years and was disciplined by his three years as religious editor of the *Independent*—a position he significantly resigned because he questioned the ethics of its advertising policy.

During the Springfield pastorate which followed, he was at the center of a very stormy theological debate. Theodore Munger, who followed him at North Adams, was involved in controversies which threatened to shake the Berkshire hills. It is not easy to overestimate Washington Gladden's really very great service through those years. He refused to be read out of the denomination. He was as steadfast as his great-grandfather Azariah at Valley Forge, being always a good fighter. One is tempted to believe that sometimes, like Job's war horse, he sniffed the battle from afar. The chapter in his *Recollections*, in which he deals with these experiences, has a decidedly militant note; as if he had stopped in writing it to take down from the wall that sword whose blade was still bright and run his finger in caressing retrospect along its edge. We owe to this period of his life his best known and now greatly loved hymn—"O Master, Let Me Walk With Thee."

Matured in every power, he left Springfield in 1882 to become for the rest of his life (thirty-six years) pastor of the First Congregational Church in Columbus, Ohio. He was thereafter first of all a parish minister. His pulpit was his supreme concern. He left it rarely (resigned from the Harvard Board of Preachers because it took too much time away from Columbus). He had no assistant for some years, received always a modest salary. He had brave dreams of institutionalizing Christianity. He never institutionalized his own church. The building to which he was called was pitifully plain (they presently rebuilt it) but he made it directly the most distinctive church in Columbus and in process of time one of the best known churches in America. He became the First Citizen of Colum-

bus, perhaps eventually the First Citizen of Ohio, but always, always from and through his pulpit and the book-lined study in the tower above it.<sup>2</sup>

### III

I doubt if any preacher of his generation has left so much behind him which is still of such living interest. This is due not only to the vigor, vitality and strategic timeliness of his message but also to the literary form in which that message was cast. He saw sooner than most of his contemporaries the full significance of our social and industrial life. God's will, he held, will never be done on earth as it is in heaven until the forms of society become the channels of the Christian spirit, and he worked unceasingly toward the realization of all this. What he began to do ran counter to the tradition of both American industry and religion. The opposition had not yet begun to organize itself but it sensed the menace of such a gospel. He was bitterly criticized but he looked with untroubled eyes into the storm.

His first considerable book on social questions is *Applied Christianity*, published in 1886, his last *The Labor Question*, published in 1911. These books cover a wide range and yet they lock up pretty consistently on certain central contentions. He was neither a conservative nor a liberal. He was both; sometimes a liberal conservative, sometimes a conservative liberal, but always far-visioned and constructive. His life concern was to save what ought to be saved by such readjustments as seemed to him necessary to its salvation. His "ruling idea," as he himself would say, is that social problems are to be solved by socializing the individual and not by the root and branch reconstruction of society.

He foresaw and would have welcomed a far greater socialization of commerce and industry than we have begun to attain—the government operation of railroads, telephones and telegraphs, many forms of municipal ownership. He ever prophesied the nationalization of land in England in this generation, but he was always persuaded that these things were not fundamental, that the individual living an entirely Christian life would make a Christian world, that nothing else would, and that moreover if we were really Christian it would not matter greatly what forms of machinery we worked with.

<sup>2</sup> My own knowledge of Gladden began as a college student three years after he came to Columbus. I have a very distinct memory of the first time I saw him out of the pulpit, standing at the corner of High and Broad Streets, wearing a sealskin cap dating doubtless from North Adams, a sturdy and wholly arresting figure.

There was a homely, practical quality in all his thinking for which he was in debt to his ancestral farmers, soldiers and shoemakers. He was impatient of any faith or any theory which did not root itself in experience and return upon life, and though his clear vision sought the far horizons, he was ever a careful and conscientious guide, holding fast step by step to the plain roads of duty, character and fellowship by which the far horizons are gained.

In such a temper as this he considered Christianity and wealth, the rights of labor, strength and weakness of socialism, the wage workers and the churches, property, economics and Christian ethics, the collapse of competition, lights and shadows of municipal reform, labor wars, the Sermon on the Mount as the basis for social reconstruction, the care of the poor, the State and the unemployed, prison problems, "tainted money," social vices and war itself.

In preparation for an estimate of his life I once took from the Public Library of Detroit every book he had written which I did not myself possess. Those which came from the library had been read again and again, their covers were loose, their pages soiled from handling, their leaves turned down, their margins marked. The common people read him gladly. His books represent an immense and continuous labor. They were all handwritten to begin with, the clatter of a typewriter never disturbed the studious quiet of his hallowed tower. He would never have known what to do with a stenographer. More than that, the most constant reading and study lay behind all his writings. He never spoke without authority, and it went hard with those who dared to dispute him on what he knew to be matters of fact.

He was also much concerned with theological reconstruction. He welcomed evolution as the very revelation of the method of God; the everlasting reality of religion was to him as light and air. He had no fear of any kind of truth; it would be, he believed, one vindication more for a living faith. He was always far in advance of his time and time has generally justified his contentions. Many of his positions which seemed so challenging twenty or thirty years ago are now commonplaces. His faith grew increasingly simple, centering itself in the fatherhood of God, in the brotherhood of man, and in his last great and all-inclusive formula—in friendship as between the human and the divine, as between all men everywhere.

## IV

He is known to the world at large for his social gospel and his passion for the freedom of faith, but those who knew him best will remember him always for the depth of his affection, the sincerity of his spirit, the wealth of his faith. It sings itself out in his hymns, glows in his written pages, accentuates his speech and above all, it uttered itself in his prayers. His mediatorial prayers were the true revelation of the soul of the man. Much else that he did and said has been kept for us, but these, poured out Sunday morning after Sunday morning in the comradeship of his congregation, are kept only in the grateful memory of those with whom and for whom he prayed.

He was a great preacher—this above all. He has left us only two volumes of sermons and, wanting his presence, the rhythmic stress of his voice, his smile, his tenderness, his mighty capacity for holy indignation, and the mounting tides of his passion, no one who reads them will ever quite know how much they meant to those for whom through the years his entrance into the pulpit, whence he came out of intimate communions and meditations and preparations, was an event, and the opening of the limp, leather sermon case which he used to protect his manuscript was the thing for which they had been waiting all the week. He was grave, strong, compassionate, a preacher by the grace of God. He knew the value of repose; he sought no effects which his message was not great enough to secure. He used words with a grave reverence. Simplicity and clarity were aspects of his native strength, they were also his noble self-achieved discipline. What was necessary to the salvation of either the soul or society he believed could be so said as to be understood by common folk, who constitute the vast majority of those who so sadly need saving. His writing is "dated" of course, but many of his passages have the timeless dating of literature. He thought of people as people, troubled, perplexed, exploited, misled, all tied up in one human bundle—never as "bourgeoise" or "proletarians." He was economical with "absolute" and like abstractions, and meticulous about facts. "Romanticism" and "realism," "left" and "right" were below his horizon. He defined positions by examining them.

He was an idealist in his vision of the city of God, never now undimmed by human tears, but lifting its domes and spires against horizons toward which a man must ever press—even though they retreated as he

sought them. He was a realist in his vision, which grew sad through long looking, of the imperfect, the wrong, the indefensible in our own and our common lives. His passages of righteous indignation are still hot to the touch. As one heard them said they had the drive of a piston—a piston which had enmeshed the lightning. The range of his mind was patterned but it was vast. Usually when he announced his text, his seasoned and intelligent hearers could anticipate the country through which he would take them. But it was a spacious country. There were in it some dusty paths and many quietly familiar regions. There were also living waters and flowers and fruits, summits of vision and a light from beyond the hills of time. And sometimes for those who heard him “the shining ones came out . . . and walked, because it was upon the borders of heaven.”

No need to speak of the far-reaching influence of his ministry<sup>3</sup> (he was one of four men asked to speak twice on the Lyman Beecher Foundation), of the ways in which his denomination honored him, of his manifold civic services to the city of his adoption (Columbus owes to him one of the best working arrangements in America between a local transportation company and a municipality), nor of the ample tides of recognition which at the end came back upon him as out of a sea of love and gratitude to bless and hearten him. He had sorrows of his own and felt deeply the sorrows of our common humanity. He ripened in tenderness. His style grew always more simple; something of the glow of his maturity softened into sunset and twilight, but the force of his last work was truly remarkable. He battled steadfastly to the end.

During the last months of his life nothing moved some of us half so deeply as the addresses on the envelopes in which he sent us his church calendars. He was writing them with his left hand, and the addresses had a strangely pathetic up and down character, which nevertheless brought them to their destination. Always a poet—who does not know his *Ultima Veritas*?—he turned again to poetry as a solace, and a little book of verses which his church published after his death is tender with the tears of things.

He had always a far-reaching friendship with the wise and great of all times. His study in the tower of the church was hung with photographs of men whose names are household names and many of them his personal friends. He seemed to those who knew and loved him to belong to their

<sup>3</sup> He built upon foundations already strongly laid; a noble church, strong in Christian loyalty and rich in grace. He owed much also to the open-mindedness and steadfastness of his people. They contributed greatly to his ministry.



landscape as Greylock to the landscape which he knew and loved in his youth. He was also a friend of all men, black or white, whom the world forgot. Little children sought the shelter of his arms. Saint and scholar, soldier and friend, he lived in the practice of Immortality, and death was for him only a door opening upon presences with whom he had long communed and an order which had always been the true homeland of his soul.

## V

Two books of Gladden's are a key to all the rest he wrote. They may serve also as base lines from which to take one's departure in any examination of contemporaneous thought in the regions with which he dealt. The first, *Burning Questions*,<sup>4</sup> is his reconciliation of Christian faith with evolution and current science. No one of his works was written with more verve, nowhere save in his poetry is his faith more lyrical. Evolution has not abolished God; He can be known and praised and prayed to. Man is still a living soul destined to immortal ends. The kingdom of God is within and among us, its horizons widening with the process of the Suns. The book is a *Te Deum* of nineteenth-century religious Liberalism, which, falling

"Upon the great world's altar stairs  
Which slope through darkness up to God,"

could join the shining ranks above and "the innumerable company of souls here on earth," and say:

"We praise Thee, O God,  
We acknowledge Thee to be the Lord;  
All the earth doth worship Thee  
The Father Everlasting."

No wonder the morning stars sang together. I remember still the Sunday afternoons in March when he repeated these chapters before the students of Ohio State University. Twilight shadows used to creep into the bare old chapel before he was done—but the music and the kindling power of it all no shadows could or can defeat.

The other book, *Ruling Ideas of the Present Age*, is the mature expression of his political and social philosophy and his Christian faith in its social implications. It adds a new religious note to *Burning Questions*; The

<sup>4</sup>Published in 1894, but certainly written much earlier. I heard the chapters given in lectures in 1888.

Immanence of Christ. Love is the mold in which creation was cast, the rudiments of vicarious sacrifice are coëval with the stars. The deeper crimson of nature is not the red of tooth and claw. The ascending process is dyed with an Aeonian struggle for the life of others. Here is the secret and law of the victorious life—everywhere. It will become operative through the changed mind of the individual. It will administer governments through a Christian public opinion.

The creation of that opinion is the task of the church and education, the control and test of it is the Way, the Truth and Life of Jesus Christ; the political issue of it will be triumphant democracy, the social and ethical issue of it the kingdom of God. A faith like this dissolves the frontiers between the sacred and the secular, all service is sacramental; to labor is to pray. The Christian administration of property, the Christian conduct of business is a spiritual service. The frontiers also between the natural and supernatural dissolve. Our present vision includes only the segments of processes whose full sweep is beyond our ken.

Under the administration of such "ruling ideas" Gladden lived, preached, wrote, thought. His centers of emphasis and application shifted; they were always in the same general region. And yet he saw himself before his death the arrent of his more generous hopes and the sight saddened him. It did not dim his faith nor abate his courage. The "calendar verses" written in his partially paralyzed retirement have in them some sound of trumpets, though it is a little hard to tell whether they sounded from Columbus or—as Christian heard them—from the other side; both I think. The most moving of them is a little song about Rest:

"Hearts that break 'neath burdens sore,  
Take the balm that love imparts,  
Learning this forever more,  
Rest is good for tired hearts."

## VI

When one turns from the study of Washington Gladden's life and a re-reading of his representative books to the current discussion of Liberalism, he is put to sheer intellectual confusion. He is on the whole inclined to agree with Mr. Dooley: "I know histhry isn't thru, Hinnessey, because it ain't like what I see ivery day in Halstead Street." . . . Something is wrong somewhere. I think myself that very many of the current criticisms

of Liberalism are far more valuable as psychological data than as critical analyses. They are "donnée" for current states of mind. Liberalism has always been under fire: it is used to it. Newman had a list of eighteen ways in which it was particularly obnoxious to him. He had a strong use of language and could probably have lengthened the list. Current criticism can be traced to three or four main sources: the "authoritarian" of course—and always: the philosophic apologists for the dictator; the protagonists for the totalitarian State—a word which does not "belong" in an article on Gladden—and the group Wieman<sup>5</sup> calls neo-supernaturalists (strange bedfellows).

The far more significant thing is a widening acceptance of their critical position. The reaction against the ruling ideas of Gladden and his school is an arresting aspect of the history of religious, political and social thought for almost the last twenty years. The reason why the future historian must be left to determine. We are too much entangled in the situation and too many things are still unfinished. Some critical evaluations can be made in successive sentences each one of which demands expansion.

Gladden and his associates did not clearly enough anticipate the winds which, blowing in from unsunned spaces, would numb the faith of the next generation. They did not clearly enough understand that the kind of religion which satisfied them did not and could not satisfy another temper; that it was likely to deprive the theologian of his occupation; that an inevitable renaissance of theology would mean a renaissance of speculation. (This, I venture to believe, explains in part the attitude toward nineteenth-century Liberalism of our younger theologians. They want something to do.)

Gladden and his school over-emphasized—as we see now, and sadly—the power of the individual as against social and economic forces, though they were not alone in that. Christianity has done much the same thing through its entire history and would not be Christianity if it did not. They did not and could not foresee how the passion of broken peoples would seat the dictator upon some empty throne; that a philosophy to support the dictator would be improvised in which liberty would become "a stinking corpse." They did not foresee that having made so little progress so

<sup>5</sup> Interesting to note that ten out of Wieman and Meland's twelve groups use in one form or another the technique of Liberalism (using your own mind freely). So, as far as that goes, do the other two groups.

sadly, another generation would deny the Gospel of Progress and, throwing the bath out with the baby, deny the validity of all the tests by which the liberal measured progress.

To condemn them for this is to ask too much of human foresight: to make little collections of their defeated hopes is a sad and futile occupation; to say they might have saved us is to beg the whole question of the vanished alternatives of history. They seem now to some of us to have been the only prophetic voices of their time. They saw and strove. The rest is history. We may turn against "that marked way of looking at things, handling them, judging main actors in them, for which," said John Morley, "with a hundred kaleidoscopic turns, the accepted name is Liberalism," in our impatience or frustration—or our fear. It is hard to see what saving alternative we are likely to find. A world in which Gladden's ruling ideas do not and cannot be made to rule does not seem a desirable world for permanent residence. They cannot abdicate. Any cause or hope which has depended upon such an approach to life and truth and duty—and the far horizons—has little for which to apologize and much of which to be proud. The banners of Liberalism, says Morley again, have emblazoned on them the names of the victorious battles of a great era. They are not now permanently in the dust.

# Letters of a Japanese Sailor Boy

HERBERT WELCH

(Translated by ELLISON BODLEY)

**Y**OKOHAMA, Oct. 10.

I am studying the books I received from you every day, and am happy to say that I am beginning to understand something of the purity and the value of the Christian religion. I am praying to the God of Heaven, who can save even me, that you will have health to teach many boys and girls of Japan of His august virtues.

*Honolulu, Oct. 25.*

From now on I am going to try to correct my ways and follow Jesus Christ. By reading the Bible and the other books you sent me my heart has become entirely different from what it was formerly. It somehow seems as if it had come out into a broad, bright place, and as if all the people around me were my brothers and sisters. I take pleasure now in doing my work, as well as in my leisure. And when I think that there is a God who is always watching me I know I shall not do anything wrong, even when no one is looking. I shall be so happy if I can somehow make my heart clean and show some kindness to the people around me.

*On the high seas, Nov. 23.*

There are many things that I want to ask about. Some time ago I read *Les Misérables*. I have been thinking of the pure heart and the unlimited kindness of the Bishop and how he finally won and saved the heart of Jean Valjean, whose life had been under a deep cloud. If God in Heaven had not been willing to forgive his sin and accept his convict heart, what would have happened to him? Would he have been always a convict and what would happen after he died? When I think of these things, I think how wonderful it is to have a Father in heaven who can forgive.

*Yokohama, Nov. 29.*

Some day I want to go into business, then perhaps I can help some

other person who is poorer than I. Please do not smile when I speak of helping someone else. Do you not think God in Heaven will be happy for only the little bit that an uneducated boy can do? . . . Sometimes I try to tell some of my friends about the Christian God. At first they would not listen to me, but little by little they have become interested in reading the Bible with me. In this way I shall try to help my brothers and at the same time to learn with them the way to a better life.

*Kobe, Dec. 1.*

She played the piano on B-deck, and I tried to sing "Abide With Me," "Jesus, Lover of My Soul," "The Church's One Foundation," and "From Greenland's Icy Mountains."

After she left the boat, I tried to sing them but I guess I didn't learn the tunes well enough. Some time when we are in port on Sunday, if I can get shore-leave, I want to go to a church.

*Hongkong, Dec. 12.*

I shall be happy to read any books that you send. I have always liked reading good books better than anything else, especially the stories of men who have made great advance or had great influence in the world. . . . I have a group of special friends now that come to my room in the evenings. We have been reading the parables together. They are very interesting and it gives one much to think about and one's work does not get so tiresome. Sometimes I even find myself smiling unconsciously while at work.

*Hongkong, Dec. 14.*

I should like to say that I came from a comfortable home, but that would not be true. My parents are very poor people, farmers. My father and mother both work all day long in the fields. They are poor but honest folks. Misfortune seems always to have followed them. In spite of that they sent my brother and me to school for six years. Then it seemed that we must just stop school and work, but I begged to stay in school a little longer, so my brother stopped and I continued in school for two years more. I would work out of school hours, then study till after midnight. Often I would be on the program for special occasions but at the last would not go to the exercises at all because I had only an old kimono to wear and



I was ashamed. But I was determined not to fail in my studies on that account. When we graduated from grammar school I was given the first honors. Please do not think I am boasting; I just want to tell everything as it really happened. I can remember now my speech on graduation day as if it were yesterday.

After graduation the principal of our school came to see my father to beg him somehow or other to let me go on to high school. I too wanted to go on to school more than anything else in the world but when I saw the troubled look which came over my father's face I thought I just could not cause him any more anxiety than he already had. So the next day I went to the home of the principal and thanked him but told him it was impossible. From that time on I worked in the fields with my father, pulling weeds from around the rice plants even on the hottest days of summer.

The spring I was seventeen years old I went with an eighteen-year-old friend to work in a mine far off in the mountains. But I was still only a boy and the men with whom I worked were rough and vulgar folks. My, how I hated it all! Then my friend was growing thinner and thinner every day. Finally he told me that he was going to run away. I thought over it for a long time, but when I looked at my friend's troubled face I just couldn't stand it any longer. So one morning very early we slipped quietly out. It was a terribly cold day with the snow piled up about two feet. But in spite of that we put on our straw sandals and both of us started out with much fear and trembling. Often we fell in the snow, but got up again and went on and on until we had walked twenty miles that day. I thought I was too big a boy to run home to my mother, so we went only farther and farther into the mountains. Finally we came to a place where some men were building a great levee, and they gave us work.

We built a little shed under which we could sleep on the ground. It was far, far in the mountains and no one ever passed that way. While lying on the ground at night I used to watch the moon and the cold stars and wonder if they were my friends. We worked so hard that by noon each day we were as weak as cotton and when night came we were almost dead. The loneliness was terrible. Sometimes at night animals would come and we would have to build a fire to keep them away. It was my duty to get up first in the morning and make rice and soup for the others. It was not funny then, but now when I think of the battered old pan I used for bathing and cooking I have to laugh. Then my one kimono was

wearing out and somehow I had to mend it. Truly we might as well have been on a desert island for any connection we had with the outside world. But even so, when I thought I was doing this to help my father I did not weaken, but worked right with the others. The next winter I got a job with some wood-choppers and worked in the forest all that winter. Still it was my duty beside chopping trees from sunrise to sunset, to cook for the others. Even now my hands turn cold when I think of the mornings I had to chop a hole in the ice to get water for making breakfast. And often when we wakened in the morning there would be snow piled high over our beds. My troubles all seem to be cold ones. Even now I cannot read about boys who are in school and always warm enough without remembering how cold I was then.

One day a kind man happened to come our way. That was the summer I was eighteen. He saw my distress and had pity on me, so he took me home with him to be his servant. He was a *sake* (beer) merchant. After I went to his home I had many temptations. They were like this. I had to get up at four every morning to clean the shop. One day when I was working in the shop before anybody else was up, I found on the floor a purse filled with money. I wanted to take it but something made me leave it there till my master came. He was much surprised, for he thought he had put it in the safe the night before. Then there were always cakes and candies on the shelves of the shop. But from these too I turned my eyes away. My master came to trust me and finally gave the shop accounts into my hands. One day my master asked me to marry his only daughter and become his heir. I thought this over for a long time but finally declined. Of course then I had to leave his employ and again I was thrown out into the world. I had worked for him for three years. He had given me food and clothes and when I left he gave me fifty dollars.

I felt very wealthy and went home for a visit with my family. I gave my father thirty dollars and with the other twenty I started out to Yokohama to find work. A kind man got me a job as sailor and the boy whose home had been in the mountains now came to call the sea his home. After I had been on the sea for about a year, I hurt my foot in saving one of the ship's officers from danger. We were on our way to San Francisco, so as my foot was pretty bad they put me in a hospital there. When my foot was better I returned to Yokohama. It was still not strong enough to allow

me to work so the S. S. Co. gave me a present of some money, and a second time I went home for a visit. But my foot was very slow in healing and I had to stay at home for a year, going to the hospital every day for treatment. It cost my father a great deal of money, so as soon as I was able I came back to Yokohama determined to find work and pay it all back to him. I had promised my parents not to go on the sea again but there didn't seem to be any other kind of work to be had, so finally I accepted this job as sailor on the Maru. I know it was bad to lie to them, but to save my parents from worrying about me I have not let them know what I am doing. I have not been on this boat one year yet but because I have always done my work well, whether any one was looking or not, I am receiving the same salary as a sailor who has worked for four years. Even this I have not told to my parents. I did not write to them even when a friend wrote me that my grandfather and grandmother had died.

Without intending I have poured out my whole heart to you. Now you know all; but I am glad you do. I wonder what the new year will hold for me. Now I am always sorry when I see anyone in trouble and I intend to work just as hard as I can so that some day maybe I can help someone else. By the end of this year I shall have paid back all the money that my father used on my account.

*On the sea, Dec. 19.*

During my leisure hours and even when I am tired, it seems to rest me to read the Bible. Today I read in Matthew from the 5th to the 7th chapters. While I was reading, without realizing it, it seemed as if I had been born right into some kind of a bright, new, pure country. I went right out and brought in one of my friends and made him read it too. In the 5th chapter, verses 13-16, and the 6th chapter from verse 25 to the end, then in chapter 7, verses 21-27, these things have entered deep, deep into my heart and I am always thinking of them. Why did I not know these things long ago? . . .

Last night I could not sleep; the sea was high and the anchor bounding against the side of the ship kept me awake, so I lay all night thinking of these things. Oh, I want to get away from this life on the sea! But I have given myself and all that I have to God and He will show me the way to something better when the right time comes. As you know, just

now B-deck is my special charge, so I shall try to be content with keeping it thoroughly scrubbed and polished. The sky is as black as ink tonight, but it is now 10:00 o'clock so I must stop and climb the foremast where I must do lookout duty till 11:00.

*Nagasaki, Dec. 23.*

The day after tomorrow will be Christmas. I never knew the real meaning of it before. That was a wonderful night when Jesus was born. I, too, like the shepherds, am now following that Christmas star. In the Bible it says "You must be baptized." But I do not know what that means. Please tell me the next time you write.

*Kobe, Dec. 25.*

This is Christmas morning. I feel as if I had forgotten everything and had become again an innocent little child, celebrating Jesus' birthday in my own heart. From two o'clock till three o'clock this morning I stood up in the crow's nest on the foremast on lookout duty. When I came down at three, instead of going to bed again I read the Christmas story in Luke until five o'clock when I had to begin my deck work. It is the most beautiful story I ever read. This morning there was a big Christmas tree in the dining-saloon for the passengers. It had many stars on it but the one in the middle at the very top was larger and brighter than the others. I knew at once when I saw it that this must be the star that the shepherds followed that first Christmas night. And then while we were coming into port this morning there was the most beautiful music played by someone on the piano on A-deck. I think it was a Christmas song. I love to sing but I did not learn the tunes well enough when Miss — was trying to teach them to me. There is no one to help me with the tunes, so this morning I just read the words of the Christmas songs in the hymnbook that you sent. . . . Oh, I wish I knew enough to teach all my friends these things that I am learning now! I think that would make me truly happy.

*Yokohama, Dec. 27.*

As I read more and more in the books you sent I wonder why I never knew these things before. I feel as if till now my heart had been in complete darkness and as if I just *must* make my friends read these things

too. This world is full of trouble and sin. I am ashamed of my former heart but I myself feel as if it had been completely changed. I do not care any more for fame and reputation or money, if only before I die even one person could say that he had been made a better person by my influence and for that reason he could not forget my name. Simply I believe in the God in Heaven and that there is no other way but to follow Him. The *sui-sen* bulb which you sent is on the table beside me. As I give it water every day, I pray in my own heart, "Oh, Lord, let the rain of the Spirit come into my heart, so that it may blossom with beautiful flowers and bring forth good fruit." If I can prepare my heart so that God can make it bloom, just as I hope by giving water to the *sui-sen* to make it bloom quickly, that will be my *tanoshimi*. Lately I cannot help wishing that I too could learn to tell people about my Father in heaven. Do you think that would be entirely impossible for an uneducated fellow like me?

*Yokohama, Dec. 29.*

I have just read the 23rd Psalm for the first time. Truly we need not worry about tomorrow or next year, because Jehovah is our shepherd and will take care of us. If we work earnestly every day, surely we can trust the future to God. His heart is large enough to care for all His children. These things have entered deep, deep into my heart. The other day I wrote to one of my boyhood friends, telling him what I am learning and that he too must read these things. In this way I am trying to share my happiness with as many people as possible.

*On the sea, Jan. 5.*

The 23rd Psalm has become my favorite poem. Jehovah makes us lie down in green pastures and leads us beside still waters. "Even though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I shall fear no evil, for thou art with me." When I read this part I think that people like me who are always on the sea should be especially thankful. We do not need to worry about tomorrow but just receive each day as a gift from God and do each day's work faithfully. When I think that God is able to care for all things, then I stop worrying and enjoy each day as it comes along. In the past I have done much unnecessary worrying because my heart was wandering along the crooked path of darkness.

I am also reading the story of Joseph. He was put into a cold, dark

prison because of his brothers and a wicked woman, but his own deeds never varied from what he knew was right. Then at a sign from God he sat beside the King and became administrator of the country. Sometimes I almost cried when I was reading it. Truly God in Heaven can help people even when they are in dark, cold dungeons like that.

In the *Aozora* I read the story of Antonio and Portia. I made some of my friends read it too. More people ought to have such love and sympathy for their friends as Antonio had, to be willing to give his life for his friend. What would have become of him if Portia had not disguised herself and gone to the court? But surely God would not let such a man be killed like that. I love to read stories like these better than anything else in the world, more than eating the most delicious cakes and candy.

*Entering Honolulu Harbor, Jan. 7.*

Tonight the moon is big and round and its shadow is reflected on the water in a long silver path. The long waves are breaking against the side of the boat as if they would go right through one's body. But their voices are soft and monotonous as if they were all joining in a chorus of natural beauty. As I stood on the deck watching the moon and the silver waves, I thought of Beethoven. If he were here he would go to the piano and compose a wonderful piece called "Moonlight Evening on the Sea." Or if William Blake were here, what a wonderful poem he could write. But being only myself I can do nothing but just stand and look and think how beautiful it all is. I think how many, many thousand years this lovely moon has shown its light and how many hundreds of years the waves have sung this same song. The name of Jesus shines like this moon to guide us through the darkness in a path of light. And God's sympathy and forgiveness are as wide and as deep as the sea—and then I am lost in thoughts like these.



# Christianity Confronts Communism<sup>1</sup>

CORNELIUS KRUSÉ

THE Russian revolution and the philosophy behind it continue to provoke thought and discussion. To theologians the pronounced anti-religious tendency of Communism is particularly challenging. Here is another book, the outcome of a series of lectures delivered by a professor at Chicago Theological Seminary, which attempts to appraise Communism from the Christian standpoint.

That Communism has always explicitly and uncompromisingly repudiated religion as superstitious belief, used by the exploiting classes as "opium of the people," and that Soviet Russia in practice has systematically attempted to win or coerce all Russians away from religion is too well known to excite much fresh interest. Our libraries and bookshops are full of books of denunciation of all things Russian, including her attitude to religion, so that another book of anathema would scarcely seem a necessity. There are, however, two aspects of the antithesis between Communism and religion, the exploration of which presents more interest and profit, namely, Why does Communism reject all religion, and what, if anything, can the Christian Church do about it? It is the merit of this book that Professor Spinka formally addresses himself, at least in part, to these important problems. The book is, furthermore, distinguished from a host of anti-communistic writings in its restraint and in its general attempt to be as objective and fair as is possible to a movement, which, one can feel, is deeply abhorred by the author.

There are, however, occasional lapses from objectivity and fairness which might have been avoided in large part if qualifications made in certain portions of the book were not later neglected or had come earlier to do their work of mitigation in their appropriate setting. For example, it is admitted that "deterministic materialism and dialectical idealism are both anathema to the Communist dialectical materialist" (p. 134). This is excellent, and indicates the author's appreciation of the complexity and subtlety of dialectical materialism. And yet in the final chapter it is constantly represented as naïve materialism, on the logically specious plea that

<sup>1</sup> *Christianity Confronts Communism*. By Matthew Spinka. New York: Harper & Brothers. \$2.00.

"materialism cannot have it both ways," accord man freedom and power to change nature, including his own, and reject spiritual forces. Such a procedure is utterly unjustified. Christianity too is subtle, and the history of Christian doctrine reveals in long ecclesiastical controversies the paradoxes and tensions within, which thoughtful Christians are still aware of and which cannot be resolved by the brutal fiat "since they do not appear to know their own minds, the choice must be made for them" (176). A non-Christian might say the same about Christians and then proceed to argue, let us say, that a Trinitarian is a polytheist or that God, in giving free will, is responsible for evil. It is one thing to accuse Russian Marxianism of inconsistency; it is quite another to lop off one of its essential branches. It then may become simpler and more apparently consistent, but it is not Marxianism, which after all is the subject under discussion.

When the reviewer was attending a summer session of the first Moscow university he was surprised to hear the constant warning given by Adoratsky and others: "We must not vulgarize, nor oversimplify." In terms of modern philosophy the present Russian interpretation of Marxianism seemed to come nearest to some kind of emergent evolutionism.

As to the official attitude to religion, the constantly reiterated expressed policy one heard was: "We do not persecute, neither do we encourage. We tolerate." In spite of much suffering on the part of the clergy and believers, it is not accurate to convey the impression that in Russia we have another Diocletian persecution. To the rank and file of Russians the religious issue is a side issue (which the author himself admits, p. 108) and the leaders seem to be following Lenin's advice, given in the face of his ardent anti-religious feelings, that the religious convictions of workers must not be outraged and that the extirpation of religion would be best accomplished by attacking its roots, exploitation and superstition, by setting up Socialism and by depending upon education (or "propaganda," as one wills) for the rest.

The overwhelming impression that one gets in Russia is not that Russia is violently anti-religious. It is rather fanatically and somewhat naïvely pro-scientific. Science is its dogma. In conversation with eager and earnest students one soon discovers their deep conviction that Communism and science alone can save society and that science and religion are necessarily incompatible. One need not go to Russia nor to Communism to find adherents to this latter belief. Andrew D. White's prose epic indicates the

tragic historical conflict between science and theology (as distinguished from religion). It is deplorable that the possible accord between science and religion—often demonstrated in theory and in practice—is not appreciated by Russians (and others) today. The author charges the Russians with being “spiritually illiterate.” So they are, but certainly, as he himself recognizes, the Orthodox Church did not contribute much to spiritual literacy, nor did it make the prevalent identification of religion with superstition, and alliance with corrupt power and oppression difficult. A church that excommunicated a spiritually sensitive Tolstoy and allowed a Rasputin to exercise power over it could scarcely confront Communism with spiritual power.

It has often been said, by Professor Berdyaev as well as here, that one reason why Communism is anti-religious is that it is itself a religion in disguise. This is of course highly controversial and may be in the end essentially a matter of definition. That Communism shares many characteristics with religion is true. But the impression given by Russia today is that one is plunged back into the thought-world of the eighteenth century “philosophes,” with their belief in the unlimited perfectibility of man and his society through the use of science. If Communism is a religion, it is distinctly a this-worldly, humanistic, secular religion. If it is not a religion, it is distinctly a *substitute* for religion and in its final “idyllic” hope for a just and classless society is not unlike the millennial hope, *for this world*, of social-minded religions. Surely, the social idealism which present-day Communism engenders in young Russians is something the Christian church may well envy.

In conclusion the author, realizing the fate of a non-prophetic and compliant Church, makes a strong plea that Christians repent and no longer continue to “think in marble and build in mud.” “The struggle for social justice,” he warns, “must become a burning issue in the Christian Church”; otherwise defeat “is by no means only theoretically possible.” For Christianity itself he maintains the conviction that its ideals are too enduring to suffer final defeat. This is no doubt true, and it is the reviewer’s firm conviction that, given time, the Russian soul, which is not natively anti-religious, will discover, as many others have, that religion may be flamingly aggressive for social justice and may be purified and ennobled to give man courage to face the facts of life with hope and reverence in his heart.

## Book Reviews

**Christ and His Cross.** By W. RUSSELL MALTBY. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$1.50.

I SHOULD warn the reader of these lines that I cannot think or write without bias about anything that proceeds from the mouth or from the pen of Dr. W. Russell Maltby. More than twenty years ago we were neighbors—his church and mine were so close to each other that it was a private joke between us that we could hear each other preach on a Sunday morning. We became close friends and so have remained to this day. After my second meeting with him, I asked myself, "Why have I not heard of this man before?" A little later I heard him preach, and then I asked myself, "Why hasn't everybody heard of him?" But his hour came soon after. The students of Great Britain heard of him; and then the heather went on fire. During the years of the war and the years after, there was no man in England who was listened to so eagerly and so expectantly by university students as was Doctor Maltby, and his name became known from John O'Groats to Land's End. Since then, Glasgow University has given him his D.D.; and he has been President of the British Methodist Conference.

Doctor Maltby has none of the conventional pulpit or platform arts. He is no rhetorician; but like Father O'Flynn, he has "a way wid him." The Maltby style is unique. It is an affair of quiet, intimate speech, sparkling with a humor all his own, punctuated by vivid, memorable phrases, revealing the depth of his own mind and his own spiritual experience and reaching down to the depth of

the hearer's soul. Always persuasive, always convincing, always moving—to hear him never failed to be an event. It may be said of him, as Saint Paul said of himself, that he is not ashamed of the gospel of Jesus Christ, even in these sophisticated and unbelieving times. It is his one "line." He has felt it deeply and pondered it deeply; and what he says concerning it is the fruit of much brooding upon it. He would be the last man to claim that he "knows it all"; but there are few of his contemporaries who know it as well.

It is something of that long, loving, patient pondering that he has gathered into this book. Here he sets out to report his own discoveries concerning the cross of Calvary. As being primarily a preacher of the gospel, he found it urgent to seek out for himself the connection between the cross and the forgiveness of sin; and here he takes us along with him in his search. He will, properly enough, have nothing to do with any "transactional" theory of the atonement; and not the least valuable part of the book is that in which he deals faithfully with such theories. Nor is he satisfied with the "Moral Influence" theory in any of its forms. He finds the great secret where it obviously lies—in the impact upon the sinful soul of a love that was true to itself through everything, even to the bearing of our human sin. It does not belong to this review to trace the path by which this inevitable conclusion is reached; but the whole study may be confidently affirmed to be a very rich and important contribution to our understanding of the unchanging *crux* of the Gospel. In one or two places, he does

not carry me with him; but I am grateful for the book, for its "atmosphere," and for the fine integrity of its thought.

The book is eminently readable. Doctor Maltby could not be dull, even though he tried; and though the characteristic "Maltbyisms" are not as frequent in the book as they are in his spoken word, yet some are here. For instance—"The writers of the New Testament were not retired theologians, with time on their hands. They were ardent missionaries who had taken their lives in their hands," (p. 23). "To take up the cross meant a frame of mind in which you are not afraid to lose your life, because you have already given it away" (p. 51). "He Himself said the only thing that could be said for His accusers—they knew not what they did. He knew" (p. 91).

RICHARD ROBERTS.

Minister, Sherbourne Church,  
Toronto.

**The Hebrew Philosophical Genius:  
A Vindication.** By D. D. MAC-  
DONALD. Princeton: Princeton  
University Press. \$2.50.

THIS is a companion volume to the author's *The Hebrew Literary Genius*, published two years ago. It is worthy of its predecessor.

The subtitle is revealing. The author feels he is vindicating something that has been denied or assailed. Is there a Hebrew philosophy? Spinoza and Einstein we know, but what about the early time? Doctor MacDonald maintains here that the Hebrews were philosophical, profoundly philosophical, in the Old Testament times. Granted that the Hebrews had no ontology but only a "philosophy of becoming"—"the concept of Being did not exist for them"—nevertheless they have a close kinship to Plato and his philosophy. This is re-

vealed by a careful analysis of Wisdom in the Book of Proverbs and by an examination of the reactions of Ecclesiastes and Ben Sira to the doctrine of the Eternal Reason, which to the writer of Proverbs is something not unlike Green's "Eternal Self-Consciousness." But "the Hebrew Absolute was a person and their metaphysic was Yahwe," and the thought of Eternal Reason was too much for the later writers as also for the translators of the LXX. Hebrew monotheism proved too strong for such daring flights of speculation. It is precisely here, however, as the author points out, that we have the source of the Logos doctrine in the fourth Gospel and it is not necessary to look to Greek sources for an exegesis of the Evangelist's words; they are Hebrew through and through and owe nothing to Philo and "his insane and non-realistic speculations." There is something Athanasian in the concept of Eternal Reason, and in a closing chapter the writer finds the Christian doctrine of the Trinity indebted to the same idea.

Frequently too much has been made of the Greek influence, both on Old Testament and New Testament, and Doctor MacDonald has done much to vindicate the authentic Hebrew genius and reveal its outreachings. His treatment of Ecclesiastes—accompanied by a full translation—is refreshing, for he shows Ecclesiastes as a "Hebrew of the Hebrews," and (like Hertzberger in Selin's KAT) finds Ecclesiastes in closest contact with Genesis. An interesting chapter "on Plato's Laws—Ecclesiastes—Ben Sira" reveals remarkable coincidences of thought and language and leads to the conclusion "the Hebrews had always been Platonists and now the old age of their thinking came together with the old age of Plato's."

There may be too much emphasis on certain points but the book is the product of a mind that has long brooded over these high matters and speaks with authority, and the author has here made a worthy contribution to our understanding of the Old Testament.

JOHN PATERSON.

Drew University,  
Madison, N. J.

**Missions Tomorrow.** By KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE. New York: Harper and Brothers. \$2.00.

WITH all the recent talk about Christian missions in foreign lands, it was most desirable that some authoritative voice should be heard to give us the facts on which to base an intelligent judgment. The motives or the duty of missionary endeavor have not been in question so much as the methods and the results. The younger ministers and students preparing for the ministry were especially in need of such knowledge. If the Church is to carry forward its missionary enterprise into the years ahead, some effectual word was needed that would command the minds and purposes of those who will be the Church's leaders in this new period.

For them this book has been written, and no future church leader can afford to omit it from the list of books that he must read. Of course, if he has no desire to find out the facts, then he should not presume to an independent judgment and should be content to follow where others lead. Professor Latourette's accurate scholarship and his ability in clear, comprehensive statement have been recognized both in Europe and in America. As Professor of Missions and of Oriental History in Yale University, he is qualified to write authoritatively as he has done in this book.

After describing with careful analysis the world as it is today and the forces that have made it, Doctor Latourette gives a masterly and comprehensive survey of the missionary efforts of the Church, rapidly reviewing the present situation, country by country, all round the globe. This part of the book is magnificently done. Nowhere else is there available such a complete statement of the present position of the Christian Church in its worldwide extension.

The second half of the book describes the forces and movements that are making the world of tomorrow. The need and the program of Christian missions in that new world is clearly stated. Here is no emotional appeal, but a strong, factual statement that will enlist the interest of every thoughtful Christian.

The missionary task of the Church is unfinished, but it is well begun. The results of nineteenth-century missions are marvelous. In spite of human weakness, the blessing of God is manifest, and that century has written a most glorious chapter in the history of the Church as it has gone forth into all the world. Now the "home-base" has been broadened out so that it extends round the world. The churches in the West and the churches in the East are now a world-wide fellowship, and their greatest enterprise is the establishment and advancement of the Church everywhere. The book closes on this note, "It is the privilege of Christians, as the old world collapses about them and passes away, to endeavor each in his own way, to build toward another and a better order. . . . What the age needs is men who have given themselves fully, so far as in them lies, to God and His will."

A. L. WARNSHUIS.

International Missionary Council,  
New York City.



**The Master's Influence.** By CHARLES REYNOLDS BROWN. Nashville: Cokesbury Press. \$2.00.

DEAN BROWN's latest book, *The Master's Influence*, is worthy of careful reading. It is written in the Dean's well known and inimitable style, simple in texture but full of rewarding insights, illuminated with flashes of wit and sharpened with thrusts of irony.

In the opening chapter, "The Nature of His Teachings," the Dean recalls the advice of his instructor in Homiletics—"Say something interesting about your text, and keep on doing that, and presently you will be preaching an interesting and a helpful sermon." He adds, "I have not always followed it, but I have not forgotten it." We are prepared to give the Dean credit for following the advice. In these as in all his addresses and sermons he keeps on saying something interesting and vital. There is a disarming simplicity about his sentences, he deals with familiar themes and verses, but he never fails to throw new and helpful light on the problems of interpretation and application of gospel truths.

Everyone has a general idea as to how Jesus worked, taught, and lived but the three chapters which are devoted to these themes add considerably to our appreciation of the uniqueness of Jesus. We are ready to agree with nearly everything Doctor Brown says; we knew these things all along, but we were never able to put the issues as precisely and as pungently as does he. And of the five addresses published in the book, the last is by no means the least—"How He Overcomes Evil." When the Dean has finished wrestling with the problem of our common enemy, he has said something useful and practical and we know to our sorrow that this is not always

true of studies of this vital and age old problem.

*The Master's Influence* will be read with profit by both preacher and layman. Some of us may take exception to the faint praise devoted to the socialist and the social reformer but we need not be unduly alarmed on that score. This is a book which deserves careful consideration both for content and method of presentation. There is a charm, a simplicity, a pungency, a practicality about the addresses of Dean Brown we may well envy.

JOHN CURRY WALKER.  
Minister, The Second Congregational Church,  
Waterbury, Conn.

#### **Vital Elements in Public Worship.**

By J. ERNEST RATTENBURY.  
London: The Epworth Press. 5/s.

#### **Our Heritage in Public Worship.**

By D. H. HISLOP. New York:  
Charles Scribner's Sons. \$4.50.

EACH of these books makes a remarkable contribution to the revival of interest in the whole field of liturgics and public worship. The author of the smaller book, Doctor Rattenbury, an outstanding Wesleyan Methodist clergyman, writes to preserve the liturgical heritage of John Wesley for Methodists everywhere. But the principles and criticisms of his book apply to Protestantism generally. The author of the larger and more comprehensive book, Doctor Hislop, is a clergyman and scholar of the Church of Scotland (Presbyterian). If his pages are colored somewhat by that fact he has yet written from the point of preserving our universal Christian liturgical heritage, rather than that of any single group of the Christian faith.

The two books have much in common. Both stress the need of more objectivity and more liturgical beauty in our public worship, of the centrality of the Holy Communion and need of its more frequent observance, and of making the second Sunday service a complement and not a duplicate of the morning worship. Both suggest evangelistic preaching and other variations for Sunday evening, and both make a plea for the use of the Christian Year.

Doctor Rattenbury very definitely centers Christian public worship in the fact that "the Lord is Himself invisibly present with those who meet in His Name," and seeks to promote this ideal of worship, through ritual forms and symbolism. He makes a well sustained protest against "children's sermons" in the Sunday morning worship. The closing commentary on the Holy Communion is invaluable for anyone who has to conduct this sacrament.

Doctor Hislop gives us a longer and much more comprehensive study. He traces the historical development of public worship from our heritage in the Lord's Supper, including its Jewish background, through Greek, Roman and early Protestant forms, including contributions by Reformed, Lutheran, Anglican, Presbyterian and Quaker Churches. The author aims to conserve what is permanent in the Catholic tradition. He opens the door for necessary changes and variations to meet present-day Protestant needs.

Doctor Hislop's thesis is at once simple and comprehensive. He avers that in common worship something is done, something is depicted and something is uttered. Something is done which makes worship a sacrifice. An offering of praise and thanksgiving is offered up to God. The Eucharist is the complete

expression of this sacrifice, which is based on the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross for our redemption. Here we have the Roman Catholic emphasis in worship. But there is a still further emphasis. Something is depicted. The eternal drama of the divine and human life stresses the incarnation. This finds "the highest paean of human adoration" in the Greek Orthodox liturgy, ceremonial and symbolism. Again, another emphasis is found in something uttered. Not only does man speak to God through sacrifice and liturgy, but God speaks to man through Scripture, creed and sermon. Here we have the Reformed emphasis in public worship, through the doctrines of God's sovereign will and grace. There are advantages in each of these emphases. There are dangers in each when stressed alone. All three should be harmonized in public worship. Here is the task for tomorrow.

This thesis runs through the fifteen chapters of the book. Especially practical are the last four chapters on "Weekly and Daily Worship," "Symbolism," "Prayer as the Offering of Sacrifice" and "The Declaration of the Word."

Those who engage in public worship as well as those who lead and those who teach will find these books stimulating and really essential for today's need.

FRED WINSLOW ADAMS.

Boston University  
School of Theology.

**The Valley and Beyond.** By ANTHONY C. DEANE. New York: Harper and Brothers. \$1.50.

THIS is one of those excellent books which will not lift up its voice in the streets and clamor for attention. Nor will it get itself so talked about as to gain sensational notice. It will, how-

ever, amply and vitally repay whatever attention men and women give it. Like all best books it will be of special value to its own constituency, which will be a very choice and fine constituency.

I have been thinking about the long line of books which have appeared in my lifetime and come to my own consciousness more or less during the years. I heard Foster's lectures at Chautauqua on "Beyond the Grave," in 1877 or 1878, when I was nineteen or twenty years old. They made an overwhelming impression upon me, an impression far beyond my understanding of them or the profound subject treated with such eloquence in them. But it seems to me now that that was very young for a healthy undergraduate to be having a real interest in that subject. Strangely enough the interest has never left me, though the attitude of men and women to the question of the life everlasting has undergone many and radical changes in these sixty years since Foster.

For example, there is probably now less desire for assurance of eternal life than then. There is perhaps less interest in it than at some other times. Many are said now to regard it as a threat rather than a promise, with dread rather than with hope. We neither preach nor sing about it as much as we used to. And I am sure we have lost much of deepest personal and religious value in that ebb that George Adam Smith spoke of as having taken place from the shores of eternity. God has set eternity in our hearts and we are not wise to set it out or crowd it out of the hearts in which God has set it.

There is, however, this single word that may be said with this good volume before me. We do think more about eternal life as a power in this one and less of it as the endless extension of this

one than we once did. The power of an endless life has a place in our thoughts it did not always hold. We do raise as never before the question whether the lives we are living need eternity for their fulfillment, or deserve it for their purposes. And somehow the answer seems to lie there in the Gospels—for us as for Jesus. He lived in this earthly life as an eternal Person would. "Knowing whence He came and whither He went," out of eternity and into eternity He lived as He lived with that truth upon Him. And life is sorely weakened and impoverished unless it is like this. Eternity is essential to a life in any real way like Christ's. This life is not up to high levels except in the power of that One.

WILLIAM F. McDOWELL.

Washington, D. C.

**The Miracle of Preaching.** The Lyman Beecher Lectures for 1936. By JOHN EDGAR PARK. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$1.75.

**Vital Preaching.** The Warwick Lectures on Preaching for 1936. By SIDNEY M. BERRY. London: Independent Press, Ltd. 3/6 net.

THESE two new volumes of lectures on preaching neither proffer nor need apology. Both are worthy additions to the distinguished offerings of the great foundations under which the lectures were given. They supplement each other in a peculiar way.

President Park is especially rich in information concerning the preaching of the past. His lecture, "The Church-Going Tradition in English Literature," is an anthology of references to the pulpit in English literature. His ministerial readers cannot but be inspired to

give more careful attention to the literary quality of their own sermons.

The lectures are rich in wise and kindly counsel. In support of that statement, consider these quotations from one lecture, that entitled "Inspiration."

"It is clear that mere scolding is out of place in the pulpit. Under a rain of denunciation most modern hearers put up their umbrellas and let the drips run on to their neighbor's shoulders. It is better to lead the congregation along, starting with certain general principles to which they gladly assent and then applying these to unexpected special instances, and modestly inferring how it is possible to escape the obvious applications. It is not a question of cowardice or courage. It is a question of method." . . . "As a fellow struggler rather than as one who professes loftier ideals than theirs, the preacher can do more to change what he believes to be an unjust system." . . . "Most heretics have been burned not entirely because they were heretics but because they were also unpleasant persons." . . . "You can get away with much of the gospel, even in the modern church, if you are humanly and religiously as well as socially minded." And then he suggests that you can be as unpleasant a person as you please if you are willing to take the consequences, but the unfortunate people are those who feel it to be their duty to be unpleasant, and yet angrily protest at the injustice of the treatment they receive.

One hardly thinks of the literary quality of the work of Doctor Berry. He tells us, in his preface, that his lectures stand exactly as they were delivered, "because he thought it better to keep the less formal wood than to indulge in any literary trimming."

He characterizes our age as an interim period in which mechanical inventions have all the novelty of playthings, and when the consequent social changes have moved us from old moorings without showing a new harbor of refuge. Men are more sensitive to tendencies than they are to convictions; they are more aware of the uncertainties of time and tide than of the things that cannot be shaken. His conviction is that this is only a temporary and passing mood that will not last; and that there is a greater place for the preacher to fill than most contemporary judgments would allow.

Doctor Berry is very clear in his conviction as to both the motive and the spirit in which the preacher should undertake his ministry. "Preaching is not an art to be learned so much as the constraint of a great experience. Behind it, as its constant and unfailing inspiration there must lie the force of an inward necessity." "The preacher must be a man whose soul has been laid hold of by God, and who has given himself in obedience to that call. If the pulpit has that equipment, it will never lose its place."

Again he declares his conviction, that "it is only the preaching which is born out of the emergencies and experiences of real life which ever touches real life." . . . "The sermon as a thing in itself ought to die. The sermon as a spirit ought to live on in the lives of men." To his way of thinking the sermon "is just a way of making people see and feel things about God." "The supreme purpose of the preacher of Christ is to win men for Him, to persuade them to Him, to lift them up to Him. The motive is always a positive one. The spirit of the preacher is love. Everything which is not born of that

spirit is just as Saint Paul said, 'sounding brass and tinkling cymbal.'"

The lecturer writes finely about the wider freedom of the preacher, but he warns that it is a freedom with discipline at the heart of it, for he adds, "You have no right to preach to men except in His name."

JOHN L. HILLMAN.

Indianola, Iowa.

**Prophets of the Soul.** By JOSEPH M. M. GRAY. New York: The Abingdon Press. \$2.00.

CHANCELLOR GRAY's latest book, *Prophets of the Soul*, will commend itself not only to clergymen but to all persons desiring to know more about the spiritual forces that have helped to shape the life of America. Through biographical and interpretative presentation of the lives of certain great preachers the author aims to trace the change of theological thought in this century from the harsh and rigid Calvinism of the pre-revolutionary period to the more liberal theological positions of today. Incidentally, he hopes that the studies may lead to "some renewal of respect for the pulpit," and, by making clear the primacy of preaching, may recall some young ministers "from the various pre-occupations they have substituted for devotion to the prophetic pulpit."

The biographical chapters deal first with the three Mathers, Jonathan Edwards and George Whitefield of the pre-revolutionary period, and then follow the trends of liberalism through the early Methodist itinerants, William Ellery Channing, Horace Bushnell, Phillips Brooks, George A. Gordon and Washington Gladden. The final chapter, which is especially illuminating, considers certain modern tendencies of theological thought expressed in the forms

of humanism, Barthianism and neo-Calvinism.

In the biographical chapters the author selects his material carefully, not attempting an exhaustive study of historical detail or of complete theological position. However, he presents sufficient material to make his characters stand out clearly and their contributions readily understood. There is a delightfully refreshing element in the narrative, and a true appreciation of the human interest appeal. Thus, as one reads these pages he can sense the tremendous moral earnestness of Edwards and feel the persuasive eloquence of Whitefield as he preached to the sailors on the East River or moved the sedate Benjamin Franklin to unwonted generosity. This human quality in the book should make it especially interesting to laymen who might be afraid to delve too deeply into the intricacies of pure theology.

In the last chapter, under the title, "What of the Light?", one finds a brief but valuable treatment of some modern movements interpreted in the light of the historical material which has preceded. The author sets forth the inadequacies of humanism which builds simply on an enthusiasm for humanity, ignoring the ultimate destination of the race, and minimizing the convictions which "only religious loyalties and ideals can sustain." Barthianism is a form of escape and throws responsibility upon a God who is difficult to reach and wholly out of touch with the present. The author treats sympathetically Professor Edwin Lewis's *A Christian Manifesto*, but while recognizing a genuine evangelical passion feels that there is a certain lack of reality, which in the case of Jesus' death makes the human history of the Crucifixion more bewildering than ever. Social regeneration must

come not simply through the exercise of divine omnipotence but through the co-operation of the Christian community vitalized and uplifted by the spirit of Jesus Himself.

This is a book for the whole Church, ministers and laymen alike. It combines interesting reading, illuminating insight and wise interpretation of history.

ALFRED GRANT WALTON.

Minister, the Tompkins Avenue  
Congregational Church,  
Brooklyn, N. Y.

**The Ancient World.** By T. R. GLOVER. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.50.

Two of those who taught the reviewer Greek remain in vivid memory. One painstakingly and quite pedestrianly taught the language with such thoroughness that it continues to be useful through the years. Professor Van Benschoten taught differently. He lived his love of Greece, he enthused over the genius of Athens, he kindled like emotions within his students, until for this one of them, beauty and wisdom and courage attend the memory and mention of ancient Greece.

Professor Glover writes that way. He provides an amazing amount of information, but he tells the Graeco-Roman story from the beginning on to Constantine with a charm that communicates a glow to his readers.

Like Polybius, whom he quotes, the Cambridge Public Orator is not so much interested in what happened as in why it happened. He holds that the soundest education for an active citizen is the study of history. Who is so worthless and lazy as not to wish to know how the Romans in less than fifty-three years brought nearly the whole world under

their rule? was the question raised by Polybius. With those who would answer, Chance, he argued that Rome had a sound constitution, managed her military affairs well, studied the world that faced her, developed citizens who were honest beyond anything known, men of affairs who genuinely served their country rather than themselves.

As in all reading of history, one again and again is guided into comparisons of contemporary situations. This review is written as France and Italy are shaking fists at each other over Spain, portending a conflict that may precipitate the continent of Europe into a desolating war. Then appears the pertinence of the lines of Vergil, quoted by Glover:

"Where wrong and right are blent,  
A world that teems with war, a world  
that reeks  
With countless crime, where evermore  
the plough  
Lacks its due honor, and the hind is  
forced  
Far from his desolate fields, and reaping-hooks  
Are straightened into swords."

There are many illustrative allusions to America as is to be expected from one who has often visited this country. Thus in speaking of the decline of the Republic, he writes: "The Italian farmer and his family were replaced by foreign slaves: Italy, like New England, saw her own people move out, and die out, while foreigners of strange tongues, traditions and religions, took their place."

Succinctly he tells the story of the Christian Church. Here he speaks without qualification. "The historian knows that the power of the Church to grip and to change men—and with them to



change and develop the outlooks of society, the beliefs on which society rests and acts—has varied with the intensity with which it has made Jesus central, all-helping and all-significant. To men outside the Church, other views may be attractive and more probable: for the Christian Church they have again and again been shown to be fatal. It is the part of the historian to record and to weigh the experience of nineteen centuries, and he must note that the danger of overestimating Jesus is not real, the danger is the other way."

The book is so closely, albeit interestingly written, that one wonders where the author has found time to do his work. To have produced such a book would justify a life-time. Professor Glover says of Plato that the man of genius who writes shapes the judgment of posterity. After reading this book one is constrained to think that some of such praise has been earned by the author.

JOHN W. LANGDALE.

Book Editor of the  
Methodist Episcopal Church.

**Christianity and the Social Revolution.** Edited by JOHN LEWIS. KARL POLANYI, DONALD K. KITCHIN. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$3.00.

THIS is an important book in which fifteen able and competent men have challenged the traditional attitude of Christianity toward radical social change. It is a debate by men of various points of view who are nevertheless united in the opinion that Communism must be taken seriously by Christians and that Christianity cannot be ignored by thoughtful Communists. The book was planned in England and most of the writers are English scholars. Reinhold Niebuhr is the only American in the

group and his chapter on "Christian Politics and Communist Religion" is one of the most thoughtful and penetrating. John MacMurray, another of the collaborators, speaks of this chapter as "peculiarly significant."

Canon Charles E. Raven, with characteristic ability, writes the introduction. "Our intention," he says, "in these papers is to give emphasis to the revolutionary character of the Christian faith, and to demonstrate that it has always contained strongly Communistic elements: to set out the grounds of the Communist opposition to religion and the Church; and to advance considerations which suggest that it is in the better mutual understanding of the two movements, and even, perhaps, in their synthesis that the hope of the future lies."

Part I discusses "Socialism in Historical Christianity." Of the seven chapters I found the fifth and the sixth of greatest interest, the titles being respectively, "Communism in the Middle Ages and Reformation," and "Laud, the Levellers, and the Virtuose."

Part II has five chapters on "Communism and Religion." Here Marxism speaks for itself, all of the writers except John MacMurray being avowed Communists. MacMurray's chapter discusses "The Early Development of Marx's Thought" up to the date of the "Communist Manifesto." The editors deliberately chose Communists to write the other chapters of this section because "inexcusable though it is, even the more responsible ethical and religious criticisms of Communism are usually ignorant of the system of thought and practice with which they disagree."

The last section has six chapters. The first, on "The Essence of Fascism," by Karl Polanyi, is worth the price of the book. Historically and philosophically

it is an illuminating and stimulating piece of work.

John MacMurray closes the discussion under the heading "Christianity and Communism: Towards a Synthesis." He makes no attempt to reconcile the conflict of views in the preceding chapters nor even to judge between them. "In no sense," he says, "is it a conclusion which carries the agreement of even a number of those who have taken part in the production of the book." It is a closely reasoned discussion of the *structural ideas* of Christianity, Fascism and Communism by a great creative thinker thoroughly convinced that Christianity must be at the heart of the "Creative Society" of the future. He considers that Christianity and Fascism are in such point-blank contradiction that neither could assimilate the other without openly and completely denying its own essence. On the other hand, "the main structural principles of Communism are either identical with, or implied in, those of Christianity. . . . The synthesis of modern Christianity and modern Communism which I believe to be not merely possible, but urgently necessary in the interests of both, as well as of humanity, could leave neither unaltered. It would transform Christian practice in a way that would make it much more nearly the expression of its own professed ideals; and it would transform Communist theory in a way that would much more adequately express the actual nature of the form of the practical life that it seeks to realize."

*Christianity and the Social Revolution*, with all the unevenness of the chapters, is a book that ought not to be missed by thoughtful students. I am making it one of a group of four books which I am recommending this year for study by laymen and ministers. The other

books of the group are: Laski's little volume *Communism*, in the Home University Library; MacMurray's *Creative Society*, and Berdyaev's *Christianity and the Class War*.

Adapting a sentence of James Hilton's I remark in closing that not being interested in Communism seems to me rather like not being interested in traffic signals. It may be magnificent, but that is all.

JAMES C. BAKER.

San Francisco, California.

**Psychology and the Promethean Will.** By WILLIAM A. SHELDON.  
New York: Harper & Brothers.  
\$2.50.

As the title indicates, the author sets out to give a constructive study of the acute common problem of education, medicine, and religion. He is both a Doctor of Philosophy and a Doctor of Medicine, and as such approaches the subject of religion not in its theological, but in its psychological, sense. Throughout the book he brings to bear all the arts and techniques of the psychological profession in an effort to sustain the essential function of the priest, the minister, and the educator, namely, the prevention of the divided soul.

Important and perplexing as are the three great affairs to which preachers and teachers are giving so much time—the economic, political, and sexual—Doctor Sheldon thinks that the really acute problem lies in the area of purposive orientation in time. It is not difficult to understand what he means by the Promethean Will. It is a splendid urge, a desire to live in the world with human heart and searching eyes, and unless one is willing to do this, his mind will inevitably settle back to a dead level. It is either a case of the mind's develop-

ing or merely becoming adaptable to circumstance.

Over against this is Epimetheus, who is the follower of the right, the adapter to the present, and the worshiper of the wisdom that is. Prometheus carries the torch to the outer reaches of thought and to the inner recesses of the soul. Epimetheus is the spirit that carries the sacred tradition, not less noble than Prometheus, but is the cement of the social order, for without him our civilization would fly into chaotic fragments. Prometheus is the man who takes the high and dangerous road. Epimetheus takes the road that leads through the valleys of safety and certainty.

Somewhere peace must be resolved between the two, uniting them in a functional brotherhood in order to resist the "waster influence." So long as they are in conflict the dogs will run away with the game.

It is a book which may well be numbered among those to which a minister goes back again and again, especially in these days when it is so difficult for religion to make up its mind. Adequate integration between one's desire to be a pioneer and that of recognizing that there are certain molds of habit which make for cohesion in our civilization, constitutes a well-balanced religious mind. Only the mind that has insight into the manifestations of "conservatism" and "radicalism," which sees these in relation to each other, and in relation to one's own inner consciousness, can be trusted to lead and confound the wasters of society.

There is a warning here against a minister's settling down in his thirties into a permanent temperamental identification with the *status quo*, and also against oscillating back and forth between opposite loyalties until he becomes

a bewildered and unhappy creature wondering whether to go on or drop out of the race.

FREDERICK K. STAMM.  
Minister, The Clinton Avenue  
Community Church,  
Brooklyn, N. Y.

**The Nature of Religion.** By EDWARD C. MOORE. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.50.

THE twentieth century has made notable contributions to the philosophy of religion and the elaboration of the Idea of God, above all perhaps in the work of Professor Pringle-Pattison. This latter is the presupposition of a good deal of what Professor Moore has to say. "It is of the intuition of God rather than of the idea of God that I propose to speak, the rational inquiry being, even down to the most recent years, thus nobly provided for." Yet it would be unfair to judge the book wholly as an objective study of religious intuition; it is far more a confession of faith, and at times of unfaith. "The pages cover some aspects of the history of my own mind in the last fifty years."

Like Edmund Gosse in a previous generation, Professor Moore suffered as a young man from the gulf between his parents' religious beliefs and his own experience. "We trusted their superior wisdom for that which we owned we did not understand. We were quite sure that they understood." But the time came when the formulae of classical Protestantism had to be rejected, among others the Anselmic doctrine of atonement and the reformation tenet of justification by faith. Since then, by his studies in the history of Christianity and more recently in modern science, Professor Moore has sought to build up a synthesis between the conclusions of

modern knowledge and the valid intuitions which he holds to have lain behind the formulations and practices of our religious heritage. The book is thus for the most part normative in treatment; one is therefore surprised to find a large section (Part II) which is purely historical in character, a mere fleshless skeleton of church history, in which many facts are adduced but no conclusions drawn.

Professor Moore does not consider the possibility that the norm of religious truth may be the infallible decree of the Church or the unerring Word of God contained in the Bible; he is reduced to reason and intuition as his guides. And neither promise very much. "God is that toward which the soul of Jesus went out in a measure which surpassed, we may suppose, the measure of any other man." "The greatest power for good in the world may well be the suffering which those who do evil bring upon those who love them . . . who are willing to bear all . . . if only the other can be led to see and abjure the evil and give himself to the good." "I interpret the resurrection narratives as the visualization in terms natural to the disciples, as indeed to others of their time, of the intuition that the spirit of Jesus could not die." These are brief and I trust not unfair samples of the doctrines which Professor Moore proposes to substitute for belief in a God, Almighty, Allwise and Allgood, and in Jesus Christ, who being very and eternal God was made Man, was crucified for our redemption and the third day rose again. The trouble is not that these doctrines are palpably untrue, but that they do not matter. Catholicism is a significant worldview; so is Reformation theology; and so is agnosticism, or humanism or whatever one is to call the

modern temper. But liberalism reduces Christianity to a vanishing point, while closing its eyes to the questions which perplex the radical skeptic. That is the fundamental flaw in this sincere and scholarly volume.

T. K. SCOTT-CRAIG.

Visiting Professor of Church History,  
Drew University.

**Jesus Manifest.** By D. S. MEREJKOWSKI. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.75.

IN the numberless and never-ending succession of lives of Christ there are revealed at once the limitations of the would-be biographers and the inexhaustibility of that life itself. No one has ever written of Christ in such a way as to make the readers fully satisfied. Always there is more to ponder and more to try to say.

These lives which already have been written are of various sorts. There are those which are predominantly narrative, and which attempt above all to reproduce the dramatic movement of that swift career which, after the years of preparation in Nazareth, moved on through the public Galilean ministry, through the increasing tension between Jesus and those who made themselves His enemies, through His deliberate focusing of that conflict by going up to Jerusalem; the dark tragedy of Gethsemane and Calvary, and then the breathtaking climax of Easter Day. Other lives, as, for instance, Holtzman's, have attempted meticulously to discuss each detail of the gospel narratives and to assess its exact authority. Others have been devotional meditations on the life and person of Christ, sometimes with rather casual treatment of the objective facts. Merejkowski's book belongs in the main to this third classification,

though without the fault of casualness which sometimes mars it. The long book is broken not only into numerous chapters but into many distinct sub-sections, and each of these is as one meditating aloud upon some facet of the life and meaning of Christ. But these meditations do not exhibit the irresponsible subjectivism which spoils such a book as Papini's for thoughtful readers. Merejowski has evidently not only thought but studied too. He has endeavored to construct his own picture against the background of authentic historical detail.

In various respects he is much more conservative than is the prevailing trend of New Testament criticism. For example, he treats the fourth Gospel as the work of the apostle John, and he uses this Gospel more than any of the others. Contrary to the recent emphasis of the Form-Geschichte school, with its conception of the Gospels as made up in homiletical rather than narrative form, he assumes that it is possible from the Gospels to gain a clear concept of the chronological sequence of the ministry of Jesus. In connection with the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand, he can use even such a phrase as this, "The time we also know with absolute historical accuracy." Now and then Merejowski has an odd way of letting his *a priori* judgments shape his conclusions of fact.

On the other hand, his conservatism is not of the kind which treats the Gospels in such literal fashion as the fundamentalists would approve. Always there is the effort to see the deeper spiritual meaning embodied in the form; and he perceives that this meaning may take the form of allegory and of mystical parable. A revealing example of his thought and also of his style is in these

two paragraphs concerning the Johannine account of the raising of Lazarus:

"Between the two miracle-signs, Cana of Galilee, the first miracle of human gladness, and the resurrection of Lazarus, the last miracle of heavenly gladness, passes the whole ministry of the Lord according to the fourth Gospel. What we have already said of Cana of Galilee should also be said of the resurrection of Lazarus—John, the incomparable Master of chiaroscuro, blends the most brilliant light with the darkest shadow in such gradation, indistinguishable to the human eye, that the more we look into them the less we know whether what we see is real or visionary. He mixes two orders or purposely unites them, History and Mystery, so that his whole testimony is semi-history, semi-mystery, or again, he purposely unites fact with prophetic dream, with what he calls 'miracle-sign' and what we call 'similitude,' 'symbol.'"

"One need only compare the two resurrections, that of Jairus' daughter in the Synoptics, and that of Lazarus in the fourth Gospel, in order to understand the difference between them. In one, everything takes place in one plane, that of history, and in the other, in two planes, hovering between reality and dream, History and Mystery. In the one case it is a homogeneous metal, whereas in the other the hardest amalgam of two metals. In the one case everything can be visually imagined, and in the other not by any means everything. Certain things are perhaps even more distinct than in the Synoptics, but others again are shadowy, barely to be distinguished by the eye, and the nearer they are to miracles, the less distinguishable and the more contradictory are they to what might be called 'the logic of sight.' Apparently everything takes place in

three dimensions, but is so told as to be impossible of imagination in three, and flows over in the fourth. Everything is presupposed as visible, but is so represented as to be impossible to vision."

To sum up: this book will not give a new or more interesting picture of the life of Jesus in its dramatic movement, but it does bring the deep and reverent interpretation of a fine intelligence and an understanding spirit, gazing upon that Figure whom no man can fully fathom.

W. RUSSELL BOWIE.

Rector, Grace Church in New York.

**The Church at Work in the Modern World.** By WILLIAM CLAYTON BOWERS. (Written in collaboration.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press. \$2.00.

THIS is a thoroughly modern volume and it has all the strength and weaknesses of a book which answers that description. It is an attempt on the part of those living in a period of "profound and swift change," to understand the significance of that change and to appraise the relation between it and the Church and to discover the mission of the Church in the light of it. Inevitably such an attempt will be denied the perspective of a later time and may even "see men as trees walking." But it is an attempt which must be made persistently by us if the Church is to serve the present age.

The writers of the book are distinguished men. Their achievements and their religious passion alike entitle them to a hearing. Nor can one read with open mind what they have written here without coming under conviction for ecclesiastical inadequacy and even sin, and without having awakened within

him a new determination to sit in judgment upon his own church and his own ministry and to discover a more effective service to his community.

The authors are sure that Protestant Churches in the mass are "institutionalized" and "regimented," attempting to carry on in the modern world "with an equipment of ideas, procedures and institutions that arose out of a past" and "no longer responds to the reality of the present scene or meets the new demands of the present"; they have "ceased to be convincing to themselves or to society."

The conception of the mission of the Church which they urge upon us includes: the discovery and expression of the Christian values that are operative in the modern world, not "in spite of its science, technology, art and social arrangements, but in and through them"; a constant challenge to "the ends and procedures of modern culture by placing them in the context of man's deepest and most enduring spiritual needs." And what a stimulating statement on a later page in the language of our own time: "It is the task of the Church everywhere to orient the human being to the cosmic order, to orient him to his fellows . . . to build a worldwide fellowship of believers, to provide opportunities for worshipful problem solving, and thus to bring serenity to persons in a perplexed world, and to produce prophetic messages describing the world which we should have." That, of course, is not all that the Church has to do, but somewhere in this book one will find either suggested or explicit all those values which the Church at its best has brought to the world and which must be rediscovered and reinterpreted for the life of our time.



There is a clear analysis of the difficulties of churches in special situations, downtown, industrial, foreign language groups, apartment house sections; a searching discussion of Religious Education; a survey of the missionary enterprise which will awaken memories of the agitation caused by the Layman's Report; a most helpful chapter on the task of the preacher; a balanced treatment of the responsibility of the Church for social change; and a splendid summary of the opportunity and the resources of the Church for a ministry to individuals. Humanists may well pause before the profound truth of Doctor Holman's words, "To believe that our little lives are but flashes lost in the darkness and that our noblest endeavors after good are but quixotic illusions with no lasting significance, is to cut the nerve of moral endeavor and to rob human life of dignity."

The reviewer confesses some disappointment in the book; that the chapter which deals with worship should have been committed to one whom we all love and admire and trust, but whose uncertainty about God robs him of what is to us the greatest occasion for worship; that when the phrase, spiritual life, is used, it is enclosed in quotation marks as if it were religious slang or obsolete; that here and there is a failure to understand the rich and intelligent piety of a multitude of evangelicals; that there is an uncertainty about immortality which mars one section; that Jesus is not given the place which some of us are sure must be His in any Christianity adequate to our own or any other time.

Nevertheless this reviewer is glad that he has read this book as he is contemplating the beginning of another ecclesiastical year, and he prays that his min-

istry and his church may bring to this city some of the religious values here so splendidly portrayed.

ALBERT E. DAY.

Minister, Mount Vernon Place Church, Baltimore, Md.

**The Church Through Half a Century.** Edited by HENRY PITNEY VAN DUSEN and SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$3.00.

DURING the life and ministry of William Adams Brown there have come changes in religious thought and church activity which are as interesting as any in the history of the Christian Church. It is most exceptional for one man to be so influential in the changes and developments of his day.

It is a fortunate thing for a man to live in a commercial metropolis, and in a city which is America's gateway to the outside world. It is equally fortunate for a man to teach in a seminary which has exerted a wide influence for many years. Such environments would contribute to a man's influence in the nation, but the influence of Doctor Brown is due primarily to the qualities of his mind and heart. He has been an inspiring teacher, not only for those who sat in his classroom, but for those who have read his books. During a period when many theologians were swept off their feet by new movements of thought, he has kept his head. For brief periods other theologians may have been read and followed more eagerly, but they have been forgotten. In an evaluation of his life and of his service, Dr. S. M. Cavert says that Doctor Brown has always been a true liberal, a man of warm religious life, and pre-eminently a churchman. American Christianity cannot honor such a man too

highly, and I am happy that his former students have written these essays in his honor.

There are sixteen of them, all deserving a consideration that cannot be given for lack of space. Each chapter is written by a former student of Doctor Brown, and, as one reads, he realizes the extent of the teacher's influence. Professor Henry Pitney Van Dusen writes that liberal theology is distinguished by its devotion to faith, its deference to scientific methods, its tentativeness to a possibility of metaphysical certainty, its emphasis on the principle of continuity, and its liberal spirit. From evangelicalism it had the inheritance of authoritative Christian experience, the centrality of Jesus Christ, loyalty to historic faiths, and missionary compassion.

Professor John Coleman Bennett pays tribute to Rauschenbusch and his influence, and finds that there has come a change in American thought since the publication of Niebuhr's *Moral Man and Immoral Society*. Today he notes with clear perception the stubbornness of social evil, increasing radicalism, and an emphasis upon the work of God in society, both in judgment and in redemption.

A review of *Continental European Theology* is contributed by Professor H. Emil Brunner, of the University of Zurich. He discusses the breakdown of liberal theology and the growing influence of dialectic theology. He looks upon Kierkegaard and Karl Barth as rewriters of theology; they point out that all truth which man gains by reason, by culture, and even by religion does not alter the fact that man, when he looks upon his own countenance, must be appalled by what he sees.

Professor B. Harvie Branscomb re-

views the controversy over the higher criticism and shows that the controversy came to an end in Great Britain long before it ended in the United States. The survey leaves two impressions. One is the quickness with which the revolution in thought has taken place, and the second is that the development has raised and not solved the problem as to what Christianity is. The real problem is whether and how the Bible can serve as the medium by which spiritual truths of life can be transmitted to oncoming generations.

President Henry Sloane Coffin notes that there has come a desire to beautify church buildings and a desire to dignify church services. There is a returning sense of God's sovereignty and righteousness. Dean Charles W. Gilkey describes how during the period of Doctor Brown's teaching Lyman Abbott, George A. Gordon, and Washington Gladden have developed new ways of preaching. There are many types of preaching today; they may not have as great a vogue, or as wide a hearing as the preaching of the nineteenth century, but they will be heard. Professor Adelaide Teague Case finds bewilderment today and feels that Christian education cannot move forward until it has a sense of Christian imperative. Professor Mark A. May declares that the educational status of Protestant ministers in America has declined steadily for nearly two hundred years. There are too many weak churches in Protestantism to support well-trained men. To be successful in the ministry today a man must be intelligently resourceful and infinitely adaptable. Dr. Edmund B. Chaffee holds that the most serious challenge now presented to the Christian Church is that of the unchristian economic order. That presents a far

more serious problem than the Neighborhood Houses and Community Churches faced a few years ago. Dr. Henry Smith Leiper sees signs of progress in ecumenical Christianity, but there are also shortcomings in the Ecumenical Movement. It is directed by a small group of men who do not have any very definite mandates from their denominations. The Christian groups of the world must come together.

It would be difficult to find a more readable or more valuable survey of the Church and its work during the past fifty years. One may find himself taking issue occasionally with some point of view, but each man who writes is an authority in the field he explores. In honoring a great teacher, his students have put under obligations to them every preacher and religious worker who picks up this book.

IVAN LEE HOLT.

President of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

**God Transcendent.** By KARL HEIM. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$3.50. Translated from the third edition of 1934 by EDGAR PRIMROSE DICKIE, with an Introduction by EDWYN BEVAN.

**Church Dogmatics—The Doctrine of the Word of God.** Vol. I, Part 1. By KARL BARTH. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$7.50. Translated from the German revised second edition of 1932 by G. T. Thomson, with a note by the translator.

FIRST of all, a word of hearty thanks should be spoken by this and coming generations to the translators who through long and tedious labor have bridged two languages, attitudes and expressions and

have made the English "make sense," as Professor Thomson puts it. They have succeeded well. It is a prerequisite nowadays to learn the new terms that theology has invented in the last two decades.

Heim's volume is the first in a series entitled "Faith and Thought." Heim is now sixty-two years of age. He attracts more theological students to his lectures than any other living theologian. It is not uncommon for him to lecture to 450 students, and before the revolution he would sometimes lecture to 600 and more. Heim had originally thought of his work on this series in terms of two volumes, but the third has appeared and there are plans for a fourth.

To one who opens these two books under review there appear similarities and differences. Heim comes from the Lutheran, Barth from the Calvinistic, tradition. Heim is the older man, Barth the younger, at fifty. Heim is a philosopher, Barth is a prophetic theologian. (Yet Heim has published some fine sermons.) Heim seeks to approach the problem of God and revelation from the basis of modern thought and life, Barth from the basis of what God has radically revealed in the Bible and to him through His Word and Spirit. Heim grows impatient with Barth's prophetic, tempestuous and glaring paradoxes, Barth grows impatient with Heim's busyness with mundane philosophy and his seeming compromise with natural science in his attempt to find some basis, even though negative, in this world for God's Word. Heim is more concerned about "a point of contact" with this generation in his attempt to indicate that it is possible to relate the necessity of revelation and the divine dimension to modern thought, while Barth regards all such concerns as a

beginning at the wrong end, a concern with something that yields only chaff and not the Word. Barth says there is no data of divinity in the world, no need for the gospel discoverable in the natural world. The Word reveals to us our plight, our need, our help. Heim is more concerned about the "Fate," or "Schicksal," of man, that crisis-feeling of need in life. Heim would say that the world is dark but that the darkness is something of a proof of the possibility of Light, while Barth would say the world's darkness is not even known without the shaft of Light from above.

This short contrast will reveal their differences, showing that Heim has affinities with English and American theism. But it also reveals Barth's uncompromising prophetic theology that is based upon God and His revelation alone. For this reason, Heim's early criticism was directed not against Barth's ontology but against Barth's indifference to ethics. Heim feared that Barth's God could have no ethical effect in this concrete world. Besides, Heim would soften the violent paradoxes of Barth and make them understandable to this age. He insists on defining such mighty words as "chasm," "abyss," "different," "qualitative difference," etc., (p. 57). A change, however, has come over Barth in recent years.

Yet there are affinities in Heim and Barth. Both emphasize the necessity and decisiveness of revelation. Both deny the spatial transcendence of the older supernaturalism. Both hold to the difference between time and eternity, at least to their non-identity. Both fear modern secular faiths. Barth, a Swiss, was forced to leave Bonn because of his forthright opposition to German State paganism and Church domination. Heim is still in Tübingen, has identified

himself with the new national Church and sees much good in the revolution, although he wars relentlessly against the German paganistic monism of "race and blood." Both are indebted to Kierkegaard. Both deal with the theology of the Reformers, although Heim belongs to a more conservative tradition than does Barth, who came up through liberalism.

If I were to sum up Heim's volume it would be called a foundation for a Christian metaphysic. While the original (first edition) size of the book was almost twice as large, the substance of this is not altered. A good resumé of Heim's thought is found in the article entitled "A Point of Contact for Our Generation," (*RELIGION IN LIFE*, Autumn, 1935). One should also read "Certainty," an article by Edgar P. Dickie (*RELIGION IN LIFE*, Spring, 1935), although I do not think Dickie treated sufficiently Barth's place of the Holy Spirit in epistemology as the Assurer of faith.

Heim claims we are facing a religious war today, between the monists and the dualists, between those who believe in no transcendent God and those who do, Materialism and atheism, and even some idealism, deny the existence of God beyond causal circumstances. He battles against both Marx and Nietzsche, those messiahs who affirmed the World Will as absolute. These two viewpoints are irreconcilable (p. 17).

Causality and creation are two things. He dwells at length upon the difference between these mentalities. We have lost the sense of "beyondness" because the universe is seen as unlimited. How shall we recover "the beyond"? Today we dualists, he says, must explain what we mean by transcendence. He therefore proceeds from the argument of the dif-

ference between the I-Thou-It relationship we bear to all we are surrounded with. There is an interpenetration, and yet a difference and not identity. Further, there are different dimensions that may interpenetrate but never become identical. There is a possibility in two irreconcilable situations that may seem paradoxical, and yet which exist. He proceeds to show how there is a possibility of "existential" knowledge which is quite a different dimension than that of anything we might scientifically observe. In this realm faith operates. He shows that there is a beyondness in and for each dimension. Chapter VI is a great piece of work in which he argues the overthrow of the sole sovereignty of the objective world-view. Further, in seeking the First Cause, we are led to two conclusions, either that demons or gods are back of causes, or that the causal factor is a wishful point of reference in the world process, in which case we are pantheists. The only other alternative is the creation idea, in which the Source of existence is God and existence is created anew every moment. This is beyond human knowledge. "This 'Creator' becomes 'Lord' by being an authority on this side of the 'Already-Become,' an authority which stands beside me in the space of the Becoming in the moment of deciding, supports and maintains my will, giving it the final lift which clinches my decision" (pp. 197, 198).

Heim closes with the absolute necessity of revelation if we are to know God's nature and will. He bears witness to Christ who alone could show the way to the "Great Unknown." In Christ a new dimension is met. Confronted with Him we sense a new possibility in the prison house of life caught between idolatry and pantheism. Thus

Heim enters the temple of faith by hard thinking, which in the end is conditioned by decision and ethical repentance.

When we turn to Barth's 560 pages we are struck by a different temper. His whole basis of thought does not rest upon Heim's logic and science. Barth wastes no time making Christian faith and its central Word answerable to science or philosophy. He is concerned with what the Church believes, with doctrine. It is not a question of discovering whether God is transcendent or not. Even the word "transcendent" is foreign to Christian faith. God *is*, He *has* spoken, the Church *has* obeyed and it *has* for its function the task of dogmatics, which is "a theological discipline, a scientific test to which the Church puts herself regarding the language about God which is peculiar to her." Barth does not argue the rationality of the Word, but seeks to clarify the fact of it.

Interesting themes are discussed, such as the possibility of calling dogmatics a science, the relation of dogmatics to the Church and to theology, the relation of dogmatics to faith. Dogmatics is exercised by the Church which is obedient to God's call, in it (Church) "His judgment and grace are praised." How is dogmatic knowledge attained? In this section Barth quotes Heim and Brunner critically because they ascribe some point of contact *in man* that might be used as a pole of reality in God's Truth. Barth will not condescend to apologetics! He maintains that there have always been antagonists to dogmatics and we should not dilute our position to their criticism now; knowledge of revelation does not stand or fall by general religious *possibilities*; the tragedy of modern godlessness is not to be taken lightly; the Church measures

dogmatics by her essence of revelation; theology refuses to discuss whether God is or is not; faith must take unbelief seriously, not fondle with it; theologians are to work at their subject matter and not talk *about* it or try to defend it.

The Word is criterion of dogmatics, of Church, of preaching. It has three aspects, that of actualizing Reality in history (yet it is not identical with history), that of Canon, and that of preaching—the latter may be done in different ways. (Topical sermons are certainly out of the question for Barth!) This Word is God's commission, not man's; its object is in His free grace; it is its own judgment and is not in man's control, and is to be listened to in obedience; it is the event itself in that it is act of God.

The Bible is the concrete medium which attests past revelation and recalls it for the Church. It is not literally infallible. Yet, the Word is mystery, because it is God's. While it always accompanies physical events, it is spiritual, personal, purposive, not of us; it touches our very existence and it is necessary for our reconciliation to God. The Word is contemporary, God's act with power to rule and a decision. It is one-sided, spiritual, and is true to its own laws.

The Trinity, Barth regards as a Biblically "possible" doctrine, although he says it is not specifically in the Bible. Yet the Church developed it. Any one who faces revelation finds that "God reveals Himself as Lord three times in a different sense." The real meaning behind it was to steer clear of modalism and subordinationism, and declare that God is the Revealer Himself and that God is the Spirit that imparts Himself to believers.

This work is uncompromisingly Biblical. It regards exegesis as the fundamental science of theology. It lacks the

weirdness of Barth's earlier writings for he is no longer concerned with the *possibilities* of the Word, but with the fact of the Word and the necessity of the Church to appropriate and understand it. He hopes to rebuild evangelical theology. Numerous quotations are taken from the fathers and the writers in the Church catholic. He has redeemed theology from slavery to scientific method and philosophical metaphysics and epistemology. He also redeems it from static orthodoxies. He is catholic but not Roman catholic; he is Biblical but not a literalist. He is scientific but he does not allow science to fix the assumptions or limit his subject. He is a Trinitarian but he sees the Trinity as an interpretation of the fullness of God. He is a humanist who regards God's activity as something concrete in history, but he does not regard things natural and human as self-sufficient without revelation. He is a liberal and his mind is open to fresh truth (witness the changes in this edition compared to the first!), but he rejects the sentimental liberal assumptions that do not square with Christian or factual realism. Professor Pauck's article, "Karl Barth Must Be Heard" (RELIGION IN LIFE, Autumn, 1933) is an excellent review of the German edition and can be read with profit as an introduction to this volume.

Barth has no idea that he has the last word on God's Word! He makes Augustine's statement his own: "God Himself alone can be the consummation of what man says and thinks of Him." In this volume I think sincere readers will find much to stimulate them to think about the only reality the Church need concern itself about in 1936 at least.

E. G. HOMRIGHAUSEN.

Minister, Carrollton Avenue Church, Indianapolis, Indiana.



## Bookish Brevities

THE national organization of Phi Beta Kappa has a committee of five distinguished persons, who recommend books to the members. One hundred and thirty-four books are on the summer list, not one of which is a book on religion.

In Edinburgh University, where he received the Doctorate of Divinity, Professor Karl Heim complimented Professor Edgar P. Dickie upon the translations of his books, saying that the English rendering is more apt than the original German.

The *Queen Mary* carries three libraries and a bookshop. In the Cabin Class library there are 2,200 volumes, in the Tourist 1,700, and in the Third Class 1,200. Books of American authorship are not slighted and the libraries are replenished with some of the latest books with each voyage.

"The Letters of a Japanese Sailor Boy" were translated by Miss Ellison Bodley. Through her they came to the attention of Bishop Herbert Welch, who forwarded them as human documents of wide-appealing significance. They go to press as fifteen hundred visiting Japanese sailor boys are impressing New York by their vigor and alertness.

John Milton wrote: "A good book is the precious life blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life." The Cardinal Hayes Literature Committee recommends books for Catholic readers which have three qualifications: (1) Are worthy of

a mature intelligence, (2) Do not offend the Christian sense of truth or decency, (3) Bear the marks of good literary craftsmanship. Thus has history an instructive way of diminishing separative differences in the interest of essential unities.

In his reminiscences on *The Ministry*, Principal John Oman writes: "My heart sinks when I see only homiletical literature and little improving books on a minister's shelves. It does not beat very high when I see nothing save religious books of any kind. And it beats with a still slower pulse when I find in talking with their owner that he is mainly interested in ideas theological and affairs ecclesiastical and that literature means nothing to him."

E. Stanley Jones in his latest book, *Victorious Living*, offers this counsel: "Try to read at least fifty pages of some book each day. If your mind ceases to grow your soul will cease to grow. You will become the victim of set phrases and stereotyped ideas—caught in mental ruts. A new book will help jolt you out. Sell your coat and buy it if you have to. Spinoza spoke of an intellectual love of God and Jesus spoke of loving God with the mind—a portion He added on His own accord to the Old-Testament quotation. It must have been important. It is."

At a period when many influential authors in their dissatisfaction with the social order are violating the canons of literature by making their books too didactic, there appears a spineless pro-

posal for a moratorium on preaching. President J. Edgar Park in his Lyman Lectures supplies the antidote: "The change in popular habits of churchgoing is less important than it seems. The disciplined preacher who has really something to give is more in demand than ever before, because people possess more things to be discontented about than ever before."

The duties of Dean Luther A. Weigle afford him a first-hand knowledge of conditions throughout the United States. Within the past two years, he has been a world traveler with exceptional opportunities for observation. In July he told the World Sunday School Convention at Oslo that it is his emphatic conviction that the world is beginning to sense its moral need and spiritual hungers and that we are upon the threshold of a great revival of Christian faith. "It will be quiet, without noise or cataclysmic over-turnings, but as pervasive as leaven and as powerful as the rays of the sun. It will be less individualistic and more social-minded than the revival of the early nineteenth century, less emotional and better grounded in the understanding of the laws of nature and of human life, less given to escape from the world and more eager to remake the world and to build therein the city of God."

Toplady said of a certain sermon preached by John Wesley that it was as dry as an old piece of leather that has been tanned five thousand times. Unjust as is that comment, it is true that the other writings of John Wesley surpass *The Sermons* in withstanding the tests of time. No other decade has witnessed as many books on Wesley as have appeared or are about to appear in this.

In 1925 Father P. Maximin Piette wrote on *John Wesley and the Evolution of Protestantism*. His book was endorsed by Cardinal Mercier, and he was crowned by the French Academy and was awarded the Belgian University prize. He used his prize money to spend two years in the United States in research study on "Protestantism in the New World," remaining in residence in Harvard University for a considerable period. His book has been translated by Father Joseph B. Howard and is to be published by Sheed and Ward. The day after the contract was signed the author received a request from The Epworth Press of London for permission to translate and publish his book.

Basing her book upon the research which she made in her studies for the Doctorate of Philosophy at Chicago University, where her superior work won a special prize of several hundred dollars, Kathleen Walker MacArthur has written on *The Economic Ethics of John Wesley*. In her studies she was especially impressed by the wide range of Wesley's intellectual interests and the very great influence of books upon his life and thought. She notes that in his *Journal* he mentions Benjamin Franklin's *Electricity*, Reid and Hutcheson's *Moral Philosophies*, de Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees*, Rousseau's *Emile*, Price's *Nature of Civil Liberty*, Peter King's *Primitive Church*, Butler's *Analogy*, Hume's *Essay on Miracles* and innumerable other books of biography, history, travel, philosophy, theology and what we now call psychology, sociology and ethics. Miss MacArthur adds that Wesley was impressed by his books, believed what they said, let them mold his opinions and received their ideas hospitably.

# INDEX—VOLUME V

**A**  
**Achieving a Worldwide Fellowship of Christians:**  
*Latourette*, 243.  
**Affirmations of Art:** *Bailey*, 103.  
**Angel of the Lord, The:** *Frank*, 124.  
**Assins:** Washington Gladden and After, 593.  
**Attack Upon the Social Gospel, The:** *Niebuhr*,  
*H. Richard*, 176.

**B**  
*Bailey:* Affirmations of Art, 103.  
*Beaven:* The Preacher and World Movements,  
 262.  
**Blessed Are the Debonair:** *Marlatt*, 369.  
*Brightman:* Vilfredo Pareto, 295.  
**"Brookings" Surveys and Suggests:** *Flemming*,  
 275.  
**Buck:** Is the Universe Friendly? 191.

**C**  
*Cadman:* Rudyard Kipling, 323.  
*Covert:* The Younger Theologians, 520.  
*Chalmers:* The Strategy of Christian Living, 230.  
*Christman:* Human Values in Literature, 113.  
**Christian Solidarity and War:** *Dancey*, 3.  
**Christianity Confronts Communism:** *Krusé*, 613.  
**Civilization Is for Man:** *Hunt*, 407.  
**Communist Drum and Our Restless Feet, The:**  
*Hunter*, 254.  
*Craig:* A German View of Church and State, 455.

**D**  
**Dancey:** Christian Solidarity and War, 3.  
*Dickie:* Recent Contributions to a Theory of  
 Christian Certainty, 17.  
 God in History, 494.

**E**  
*Ellmott:* The Minister His Own Theologian, 201.  
*Ellwood:* The Social Sciences and Religion, 576.

**F**  
*Findlay:* The Secret of Jesus, 216.  
**Flemming:** "Brookings" Surveys and Suggests,  
 275.  
*Flew:* The Vision of God, 163.  
*Frank:* The Angel of the Lord, 124.  
**Further Thought on Form Criticism:** *Grant*, 532.

**G**  
*Gealy:* Manchurian Miniatures, 431.  
**German View of Church and State, A:** *Craig*, 455.  
**God in History:** *Dickie*, 494.  
**Grant:** Further Thought on Form Criticism, 532.

**H**  
**Half-Century of Liberal Theology, A:** *Van Dusen*,  
 336.  
*Hannam:* The Man Who Saw the Grace of God—  
 A Study of Barnabas, 417.  
**Has the Concept of Humanity a Scientific Basis?**  
*Milum*, 52.  
**Horne:** Problems and Progress in Achieving a  
 Christian Commonwealth, 78.  
*Hoyle:* What Should I Read? 445.  
**Human Values in Literature:** *Chrisman*, 113.  
**Hunt:** Civilization Is for Man, 407.  
**Hunter:** The Communist Drum and Our Restless  
 Feet, 254.  
**Hym:** The Reformation and Present Problems,  
 564.

**I**  
**In a Time Like This:** *Patton*, 425.  
**Is the Universe Friendly?** *Buck*, 191.

**J**  
**Jackson:** Modern Theological Education, 398.  
**Jesus, Son of Man:** *Phillips*, 207.

**K**  
**Krusé:** Christianity Confronts Communism, 613.

**L**  
*Lake, Kirsopp and Silva:* Some Recent Discov-  
 eries, 89.  
**Latourette:** Achieving a Worldwide Fellowship of  
 Christians, 243.  
**Letters of a Japanese Sailor Boy:** *Welch, Her-*  
*bert*, 605.  
*Lewis:* Normative Psychology of Religion, 132.  
**Liberalism, Scholarship and Politics:** *Liebert*, 49.  
*Liebert:* Liberalism, Scholarship and Politics, 49.

**M**  
*McCall:* The Riddle's Key, 64.  
*McConnell:* S. Parkes Cadman, 483.  
*McCown:* Recent Palestinian Archaeology, 552.  
**Man Who Saw the Grace of God, The—A Study**  
**of Barnabas:** *Hannam*, 417.  
**Manchurian Miniatures:** *Gealy*, 431.  
*Marlatt:* Blessed Are the Debonair, 369.  
**Milum:** Has the Concept of Humanity a Scientific  
 Basis? 52.  
**Minister His Own Theologian, The:** *Ellmott*, 201.  
**Ministry of Error, The:** *Robinson*, 182.  
**Modern Theological Education:** *Jackson*, 398.

**N**  
*Niebuhr, H. Richard:* The Attack Upon the Social  
 Gospel, 176.  
**Normative Psychology of Religion:** *Lewis*, 132.  
*Norwood:* The Struggle for International Sanity,  
 584.

**O**  
**Organic Principle of the Church, The:** *Stafford*,  
 354.

**P**  
*Patton:* In a Time Like This, 425.  
*Pauck:* Salvation, 37.  
*Phillips:* Jesus, Son of Man, 207.  
*Pickett:* The Training of the Pastor, 41.  
**Preacher an Interpreter, The:** *Woodburne*, 544.  
**Preacher and World Movements, The:** *Beaven*,  
 262.  
**Problems and Progress in Achieving a Christian**  
**Commonwealth:** *Horne*, 78.  
**Prophet Versus Scholar—Luther and Erasmus:**  
*Richardson*, 285.

**R**  
**Recent Contributions to a Theory of Christian**  
**Certainty:** *Dickie*, 17.  
**Recent Palestinian Archaeology:** *McCown*, 552.  
**Reformation and Present Problems, The:** *Hyma*,  
 564.  
**Religion as Response:** *Shaw*, 514.  
**Repent—and Be Thankful:** *Welch, E. Paul*, 31.  
**Revolt of Israel's Prophets Against Nationalism**  
**in Religion, The:** *Waterman*, 380.  
**Richardson:** Prophet Versus Scholar—Luther and  
 Erasmus, 285.

Riddle's Key, The: *McCall*, 64.  
 Robinson: The Ministry of Error, 182.  
 Rudyard Kipling: *Cadman*, 323.

## S

S. Parkes Cadman: *McConnell*, 483.  
 Salvation: *Pauck*, 37.  
 Schofield: Unfinished Business, 388.  
 Secret of Jesus, The: *Findlay*, 216.  
 Shaw: Religion as Response, 514.  
 Social Sciences and Religion, The: *Ellwood*, 576.  
 Some Recent Discoveries: *Lake*, *Kirsopp* and  
*Silva*, 89.  
 Stafford: The Organic Principle of the Church,  
 354.  
 Strategy of Christian Living, The: *Chalmers*,  
 230.  
 Struggle for International Sanity, The: *Norwood*,  
 584.

## T

*Thelen*: Thinking Through the Meaning of the  
 Holy Spirit, 222.  
 Thinking Through the Meaning of the Holy  
 Spirit: *Thelen*, 222.  
 Training of the Pastor, The: *Pickett*, 41.

## U

Unfinished Business: *Schofield*, 388.

## V

*Van Dusen*: A Half-Century of Liberal Theology,  
 336.  
 Vilfredo Pareto: *Brightman*, 295.  
 Vision of God, The: *Flew*, 163.

## W

Washington Gladden—and After: *Atkins*, 593.  
*Waterman*: The Revolt of Israel's Prophets  
 Against Nationalism in Religion, 380.  
*Welch, E. Par*: Repent—and Be Thankful, 31.  
*Welch, Herbert*: Letters of a Japanese Sailor Boy,  
 605.  
 What Should I Read? *Hoyle*, 445.  
*Woodburne*: The Preacher an Interpreter, 544.

## Y

Younger Theologians, The: *Cavert*, 520.  
 Book Reviews, 143, 304, 459, 618.  
 Bookish Brevities, 158, 319, 479, 637.

215

